

In Search of Monothelitism

JACK TANNOUS

One of the most intractable theological problems confronting Christian thinkers in the East in late antiquity and the early middle ages was how to understand the joining of the human and divine in the Incarnate Christ. All the various groups believed that Christ was one and that he was fully human and fully divine, but they disagreed on how exactly this worked. Not only did they disagree, they also believed that their opponents held views which, whatever a particular group might have said to the contrary, effectively undercut the possibility of Christ being fully human, fully divine, or properly one.

Attempts to deal with this conundrum produced various theological positions. Those who adhered to the Council of Chalcedon of 451 affirming that Christ was incarnate in two natures, one human, one divine, have been called Dyophysites. Those who rejected Chalcedon, holding that Christ was incarnate in one nature, out of two, have been called Monophysites or Miaphysites. Another group, whose center of gravity lay outside the Roman Empire, in Persian-controlled territory, also believed that Christ was incarnate in two natures, but did not accept the Council of Ephesus (431). This group has traditionally been referred to as “Nestorian,” but is more properly referred to as the Church of the East.¹ Though the Church of the East

would eventually hold that Christ was incarnate in two hypostases, a view that was directly at odds with the Chalcedonian definition, this belief may not have been articulated until the mid-sixth century and, at any rate, the Church of the East’s understanding of the meaning of “hypostasis” (*gnoma* in Syriac) was not the same as Chalcedon’s. What is more, as Dyophysites, the Church of the East’s attitude toward Chalcedon was complex and less negative than that of the Miaphysites, though it never actually accepted the Chalcedonian definition.²

Church: A Lamentable Misnomer,” *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 78 (1996): 23–35, and D. Winkler, “Miaphysitism: A New Term for Use in the History of Dogma and in Ecumenical Theology,” *The Harp* 10 (1997): 33–40.

2 S. P. Brock, “The Christology of the Church of the East in the Synods of the Fifth to Early Seventh Centuries,” in *Aksum–Thyateira: A Festschrift for Archbishop Methodios* ed. G. Dragas (London, 1985), 87–121 discusses the Christology of the Church of the East in the late antique period, with frequent reference to its attitude toward Chalcedon. The most influential theological authority for the Church of the East was Theodore of Mopsuestia. Recovery of Theodore’s *On the Incarnation*—a manuscript of which was still in existence up until the First World War—would do much to shed light on what theologians in the Church of the East may have thought about Chalcedon. On this text, see M. Richard, “La tradition des fragments du traité *Περὶ τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως* de Théodore de Mopsueste,” *Muséon* 56 (1943): 55–75 (= article no. 41 in *Opera Minora*, vol. 2 [Turnhout and Leuven, 1977]). The first clear example of a member of the Church of the East articulating the view that Christ had two hypostases—against the Chalcedonian belief that he had one—can be found in Paul of Nisibis’s conversation with the Emperor Justinian in 561. See A. Guillaumont, “Justinien et

1 Or “East Syrian,” or “belonging to the Church of the East.” For a general overview of these questions and issues of nomenclature, which can be complex, see S. P. Brock, “The ‘Nestorian’

The sixth and especially the seventh century witnessed the development of a new Christological option in Chalcedonian and Miaphysite circles, one which emphasized Christ's having one energy. Adherents of the doctrinal stance that the incarnate Christ had one energy, or operation, have been referred to as Monenergists and the controversy surrounding Monenergism eventually turned into a controversy about Monotheletism, the doctrine that the incarnate Christ had one will.

All of these various major Christological options were equally well grounded and considered, yet the seriousness of the Monenergist and Monothelete contribution to the debate over Chalcedon and to Christian attempts at understanding the union of the human and divine in the incarnate Christ has tended to be passed over or treated as a shallow contrivance. "Monotheletism had been initiated by state and Church authorities," a recent author on the topic has written; "[a]n artificial doctrine, it was designed by the élite and imposed on the broader masses."³ Such a view has been typical of much scholarship on Monenergism and Monotheletism.

For many historians these Christological controversies and the various theological positions taken are for the most part confusing and uninteresting. My goal in this article will be to look at the Monenergist-Monothelete dispute of the seventh century in a way that makes it slightly less confusing and, I hope, a bit more interesting. My analysis will try to take a *via media* between theology and politics: I will leave aside topics like the nature of Christ's gnomic will or the intricacies of the number of energies he had after the Incarnation and at the same time resist reductivist impulses to describe this controversy in terms of imperial or ecclesiastical maneuverings.⁴ Instead, I want to

try to understand the controversy with reference to two factors: geography and perceived continuity with the Christian past.

Monenergism-Monotheletism, I want to suggest, represented a regional orthodoxy. By the end of the seventh century, it had become the standard view of those Chalcedonians in Syria who concerned themselves with Christological matters.⁵ What is more, I want to suggest that Monenergists and Monotheletes themselves viewed their relationship to the Christian past in very much the same way that Dyotheletes did, as one of legitimate continuity. Monenergists and Monotheletes would point back to Orthodox authority figures who had spoken of Christ having one will or one energy as offering legitimation for their positions. Although modern scholars, equipped with a finely textured historical consciousness, suggest that it would be anachronistic to suppose that these earlier authorities held full-blown and self-consciously Monenergist and Monothelete beliefs, the language of these earlier authorities nevertheless permitted figures in the seventh century to plausibly invoke them as predecessors in their belief.

Beyond even this question of perceived continuity, Monenergists-Monotheletes and Dyotheletes were essentially indistinguishable in terms of their polemical methods and both could lay claim to orthodox Christian precedents. Doctrine apart, perhaps the biggest difference between the two sides was that Dyotheletes were ultimately much more effective than Monotheletes in using this same set of tactics to make and push their case, at least in the Greek- and Latin-speaking contexts that have been the traditional focus of historians of Christian thought: it was Dyotheletism that eventually triumphed among Chalcedonians—large numbers of its texts were transmitted, its advocates were venerated, and its councils came to be regarded as authoritative. Monotheletism, however, suffered nearly the exact opposite fate.

l'Église de Perse," *DOP* 23 (1969–70): 39–66 and idem, "Un colloque entre orthodoxes et théologiens nestoriens de Perse sous Justinien," *Comptes-rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, Paris* (1970): 201–7. I am grateful to Lucas van Rompay for bringing this point to my attention and for these bibliographic references.

3 C. Hovorun, *Will, Action and Freedom: Christological Controversies in the Seventh Century* (Leiden–Boston, 2008), 93.

4 For the theological issues at stake, see Hovorun, *Will, Action and Freedom* and C. Lange, *Mia energeia: Untersuchungen zur Einigungspolitik des Kaisers Heraclius und des Patriarchen Sergius von Constantinopel* (Tübingen, 2012).

5 My thoughts on this subject have been influenced by conversations with Sebastian Brock and by the model of heresy and doctrinal difference he put forth in "The Thrice-Holy Hymn in the Liturgy," *Sorbornost* 7 (1985): 24–34. M. Levy-Rubin, "The Role of the Judaean Desert Monasteries in the Monothelite Controversy in Seventh-Century Palestine," in *The Sabaite Heritage in the Orthodox Church from the Fifth Century to the Present*, ed. J. Patrich (Leuven, 2001), 283–300, makes similar arguments with respect to Palestine.

The view that Monenergism-Monotheletism was something of an artificial and failed compromise (and its often unspoken corollary, that Dyotheletism was somehow more authentic, ancient, and organically related to the Chalcedonian and Christian tradition) is essentially a perspective that adopts Dyothelete polemics against Monenergists-Monotheletes and fails to recognize that the latter portrayed the former in precisely the same way. Such a view also fails to grapple seriously with the fact that Syria, the only region where Monenergism and Monotheletism seemed to have put down lasting roots and where these doctrines left their strongest textual remains among Chalcedonians, was under imperial control and subject to direct imperial theological pressure only for a short period of time, roughly the 630s. For a doctrine that was supposed to have been invented by an emperor and a small number of theological elites, it had quite a surprising and persistent afterlife.⁶

Recent attempts to historicize Dyothelete belief have injected historical nuance into how we speak about Monenergism and Monotheletism—arguing that the latter should be carefully distinguished from the former and that Monotheletism cannot be spoken about as a real theological option until the mid- to late 630s⁷—have focused on the actions of a few individuals (Honorius, Heraclius, and Pyrrhus), none of whom was theologically active in Syria after the supposed birth of Monotheletism in 635 and its elaboration a few years later. This understanding suffers from the same weaknesses as views that unconsciously adopt the stance of Dyothelete polemics, for, though the careful historical reading of the approach is welcome, it nevertheless leaves the problem of explaining how this doctrine, which was allegedly invented “accidentally” by Honorius,⁸ came to be so firmly grounded in a place (Syria) and a language (Syriac) that was outside of the control, linguistic and political, of the men who were doing the inventing.

Casting Monotheletism as a doctrine that was either artificial or accidental places too much agency in too few hands; it is tantamount to espousing a Great Man theory of Christian doctrine, of suggesting that Christian doctrines, both good and bad, are made by great men. Primary sources that tend to focus on doctrinal heroes and villains are conducive to making such approaches plausible. But whatever their appeal, these approaches suffer from the same weaknesses as Great Man theories of history. Characterizing Monotheletism as artificial or accidental can perhaps explain why Monotheletism inside the empire vanished (imperial suppression can be invoked) and why Monotheletism disappeared in Egypt (as an artificial or an accidental doctrine which originated from elite circles, it had no real roots), but we are still left with the challenge of explaining the existence and resilience of Syrian Monotheletism. An argument from artificiality cannot work since the continued existence of self-consciously Monothelete communities in Syria suggests precisely the opposite, that it was not an artificial or accidental doctrine. And at the same time, if it is suggested that Monenergism, or later, Monotheletism, was simply a version of Neo-Chalcedonianism popular throughout the eastern empire which survived in Syria merely because Constantinople could not suppress it there,⁹ it must be asked, why did Monotheletism not survive, persist, and indeed flourish in Arab-ruled Egypt or Arab-ruled Palestine as it did in Arab-ruled Syria?¹⁰ To this suggestion, it should also be pointed out that the Umayyad Caliph Marwān II unsuccessfully

6 Hovorun, *Will, Action, and Freedom*, 96, attributes the spread of Monotheletism in Syria to the influence of the monks of Beth Maron and suggests that the latter adopted Monotheletism out of support for Heraclius, who had visited their monastery on perhaps more than one occasion.

7 See M. Jankowiak, “The Invention of Dyotheletism,” *StP* 63 (2013): 335–342, especially 338 and 342.

8 Ibid.

9 K.-H. Uthemann’s view (“Der Neuchalkedonismus als Vorbereitung des Monotheletismus: Ein Beitrag zum eigentlichen Anliegen des Neuchalkedonismus,” *StP* 29 [1997]: 373–413) that the Monenergist-Monothelete crisis of the seventh century was a crisis within the Neo-Chalcedonian movement does not mean that Miaphysites before the seventh century were not also using the language of one energy. Lange, *Mia energieia*, 417–28, discusses sixth-century Miaphysites who spoke of one energy in the incarnate Christ. It was no doubt the convergence between sixth-century Miaphysite and Neo-Chalcedonian thinkers on this point that made the doctrine of the one energy an attractive element to include in a formula of union. I will discuss below evidence for conflicts in the Miaphysite community of Alexandria caused by Monenergism. These conflicts suggest that the Monenergist controversy was more than simply an intra-Chalcedonian dispute.

10 Though I have disagreed with it, I owe this suggestion about Monenergism being a Neo-Chalcedonian movement that survived outside the empire to the generous comments of an anonymous reviewer.

attempted to suppress Monotheletism and impose Dyothetism in Syria through both violence and financial penalty around 745.¹¹ The exceptional nature of the Chalcedonian community in Syria must be explained. Of all the Chalcedonian communities in late antiquity and the early middle ages, Syria's alone experienced a lasting split. The process began perhaps in the late seventh century and certainly seems to have been underway by the third decade of the eighth. It was a process that happened while the region was outside the political control of the emperor and its result was that Syria's Chalcedonians became two communities—the Maronite and the Melkite (today called *Rūm Orthodox*) churches, the former Monothelete and the latter Dyothete. To explain Syrian Monotheletism, I will suggest, attention needs to be paid to more than just the actions of a few individuals in creating, shaping, and propagating distinctive doctrinal systems. Room needs to be made for the *lex orandi*.¹² I will return to this in my conclusion.

Before we depart for Syria, it would perhaps be useful to address a hesitation that sometimes surrounds any such investigation: to what extent were everyday Christians actually concerned about finer points of Christological debate? The overwhelming mass of the population of Syria (and the Roman Empire) must have been rural and must have been engaged in agrarian pursuits.¹³ How much did an early medieval *fallāḥ* really

care about the number of natures, energies, or wills in the Incarnate Christ?

This is a difficult question to answer in a satisfying way. Our sources, such as they are, usually embody clerical perspectives and for this reason are slanted in one direction—what we have are the voices of the people who did care, deeply, about these matters. We unfortunately do not hear from individuals for whom the issues were not necessarily pressing, the kind of people, for instance, who might adopt whatever doctrine passed for orthodoxy in the name of advancing a career.¹⁴ At the same time, it is worth pointing out that parents belonging to different churches disagreed over which church to raise their children in,¹⁵ that children thought the faith of their fathers was in error and adhered to a different one and that fathers withheld food and other help to try to force their children back to a different faith,¹⁶ that there were many people who were Orthodox, whose parents were not,¹⁷ that there were Miaphysite priests whose parents had been non-Miaphysite,¹⁸ that a master belonging to one confession abused a servant belonging to another confession over their religious differences to the point that the latter, refusing to change, died.¹⁹ Echoing the words of Jesus, Evagrius Scholasticus acknowledged that Christological differences had the ability to set members of families against one another when speaking about the different Christological stances of Justinian and Theodora: “for when the faith is a matter of dispute,” he wrote, “fathers are divided against their children, children against the authors of their birth, a wife against her own husband, and again a husband against his own wife.”²⁰

11 J.-B. Chabot, ed., *Chronique de Michel le Syrien, patriarche Jacobite d'Antioche, 1166–99* (Paris, 1899–1910), 4:467 = 2:511 (French translation). See also R. G. Hoyland, *Theophilus of Edessa's Chronicle and the Circulation of Historical Knowledge in Late Antiquity and Early Islam*, TTH 57 (Liverpool, 2011), 258. For this date, see idem, *Seeing Islam as Others Saw It* (Princeton, 1997), 662–63. J. Gribomont, “Documents sur les origines de l'Église maronite,” *POr* 5 (1974): 121–22, places these events in 744/45. I have translated the entire incident in note 32, below.

In this paper, I shall refer to the medieval patriarch and historian commonly called “Michael the Syrian” as Michael the Great. The latter more closely mirrors how he is referred to in the Syriac tradition, Michael Rabo. The name Michael Rabo can also be translated as “Michael the Elder.” See W. Witakowski, “Michael the Elder (the Syrian),” *ARAM* 15–16 (1998): 28.

12 On the importance of keeping Christian devotion in mind when discussing the development of doctrine, see most recently M. E. Johnson, *Praying and Believing in Early Christianity: The Interplay between Christian Worship and Doctrine* (Collegeville, Minn., 2013).

13 A. Walmsley estimates that more than 80 percent of Syria's early medieval population lived in rural settlements. See idem, *Early Islamic Syria: An Archaeological Assessment* (London, 2007), 72.

14 See *Codex Justinianus* 1.5.18.5; for this point, see A. Kaldellis, ed. and trans., *Procopius: The Secret History with Related Texts* (Indianapolis, 2010), 53, n. 82. Procopius may in fact be a rare example of someone who speaks explicitly about his lack of interest in the Christological controversies.

15 See *Codex Justinianus*, 1.5.12.18.

16 Ibid., 1.5.12.19.

17 Ibid., 1.5.19.

18 See the question of Addai to Jacob of Edessa (d. 708), preserved in Mardin Syriac 310, fols. 212b–213b and Harvard Syriac 93, fols. 25a–26a.

19 For this, see the letter from John, the Stylite of Litarb, to Jacob of Edessa in A. Vööbus, ed., *The Synodicon in the West Syrian Tradition*, vol. 1, CSCO 367, *Scriptores Syri* 161 (Louvain, 1975), 243.

20 *Historia Ecclesiastica* 4.10. Trans. E. Walford, *A History of the Church in Six Books, from AD 431 to AD 594* (London, 1846),

Differences in belief between parents and children and between masters and servants suggest that some people, not just intellectual elites, took religious questions and Christological differences quite seriously. Polychronius, a Monothelete monk anathematized at the Sixth Council, was brought to the Council's attention as someone who "deceived simple people" with his false and impious teaching.²¹ People may have been willing to subordinate doctrinal beliefs to other, more pressing real-life concerns,²² but this does not mean they did not care about those beliefs at all. What is more, once separate clergy were formed—as would eventually happen with Monotheletes in Syria—questions of orthodoxy, heresy, and ecclesiastical belonging and affiliation would impinge on ordinary people's lives in a host of quotidian ways: marrying, baptizing, taking the Eucharist, praying, and burying all might be affected by the question of one's ecclesiastical community.

Geography

At some point in late 629 or in the early 630s, the Emperor Heraclius held a meeting in Mabbug with

199. Compare with Matt. 10:34–37. Another English translation of this passage is available in M. Whitby, *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius Scholasticus*, TTH 33 (Liverpool, 2000), 410.

21 My translation. R. Riedinger, ed., *Concilium Universale Constantinopolitanum Tertium*, ACO 2.2.2 (Berlin, 1992), 664.1–2: τοὺς ἀπλουστέρους ἀπατᾷ διὰ τῆς ἀσεβοῦς αὐτοῦ ψευδοδιδασκαλίας. He was also described as a person who led people astray, λαοπλάνον, see ACO 2.2.2:682.2. The belief of ordinary people is a topic that occurs regularly in late antique Christian literature. For example, Athanasius in his *Epistula ad monachos* (CPG 2108) complained of Arians who went around with no other purpose than to deceive the innocent, τοὺς ἀκεραίους ἐξαπατῶσι (PG 26:1188A). Timothy Aelurus wrote that doctrinal subtlety should not be required of "an ordinary, simple person" seeking to be in communion with his Miaphysite community (trans. R. Y. Ebied and L. R. Wickham, "A Collection of Unpublished Syriac Letters of Timothy Aelurus," *JTS* 21 [1970]: 365). Jacob of Edessa spoke of "simple people" who hold heresy "out of a certain custom, so to speak, and not out of wickedness" (my translation), see Mardin 310, fols. 212b–213b and Harvard Syriac 93, fols. 25a–26a. Henceforth, I will refer to the two parts of R. Riedinger, ed., *Concilium Universale Constantinopolitanum Tertium*, ACO 2.2.1–2 (Berlin, 1990–92) as ACO 2.2.1 and ACO 2.2.2 and to R. Riedinger, ed., *Concilium Lateranense a. 649 celebratum*, ACO 2.1 (Berlin, 1984) as ACO 2.1.

22 See my "You Are What You Read: Qenneshre and the Miaphysite Church in the Seventh Century," in *History and Identity in the Late Antique Near East*, ed. P. J. Wood (Oxford and New York, 2013), 83–102.

Athanasius I Gamolo, the Miaphysite Patriarch of Antioch, and twelve other Miaphysite bishops.²³ At this meeting, according to Michael the Great, Heraclius tried to get the bishops to accept a statement of faith he had written which confessed one Christ in two natures with one energy and one will—a Monothelete and Monenergist understanding of Chalcedon.²⁴ The church leaders refused. What is more, the bishops would not give the emperor communion.

This did not make Heraclius happy. Michael tells us that in response the enraged ruler wrote to the entire Empire and ordered that the nose and ears be cut off of anyone who did not accept the Council of Chalcedon; their houses should be plundered, too. "This persecution lasted not a short time," Michael reported,

Many monks agreed with the Synod [of Chalcedon]. The monks of Beth Maron and the ones from Mabbug and Ḥimṣ and the regions of the south showed their brutality; most of them agreed with the Synod [of Chalcedon] and they seized the mass of the churches and monasteries. Heraclius did not allow the Orthodox [i.e., the Miaphysites] to enter before him and would not receive their accusations concerning the seizure of their churches.²⁵

This story contains a noteworthy piece of information for students of the development of the Monenergist-Monothelete controversy: it suggests that there was a not insignificant contingent of monks in Syria who were willing to use the rejection of a Monenergist interpretation of Chalcedon as a reason for seizing Miaphysite property.

If any of the violent monks had been theologically inclined and had read over Heraclius's statement of faith, the chances are that he would not have found an affirmation of there being one energy or activity in Christ odd. The same can be suggested for the Miaphysite bishops who refused Heraclius

23 For the date of this meeting and other accounts of it, see F. Winkelman, *Der monenergetisch-monotheletische Streit* (Frankfurt am Main, 2001), 62–3, no. 24a.

24 Though note that Heraclius's statement of faith, as recorded by Michael, affirms one energy and not one will: *Chronique de Michel le Syrien* (n. 11 above), 4:403–4 (2:401–3 Fr. trans.).

25 My translation. Ibid., 4:410 (2:412 trans.).

communion—by the third decade of the seventh century, both Miaphysite and Chalcedonian theologians throughout the eastern Mediterranean had been speaking of the number of energies in the incarnate Christ for some time.²⁶ The issue, however, had not yet become contested among Christian thinkers.

If we move ahead about a century, however, we find that the theological situation in Syria had evolved and the ecclesiastical climate, at least among Chalcedonians, had gone in a definite direction concerning Christ's wills and energies. By this point, Syria's Chalcedonian community was firmly and self-consciously Monothelite. According to Michael, in fact, Monothelitism would be the dominant Christological view among Chalcedonians in Syria until the year 727:

Even though we have already spoken of the heresy of Maximus, how Constantine caused it to enter the church of the Romans after it was blotted out by his father Constans, we will now provide information about the schism that took place among them in this year 1038 [=AD 727] on account of this heresy [Dyothelitism] and on account of the phrase "who was crucified." Now, while this doctrine [sc. Dyothelitism] had held sway in the regions of the Romans from the time of Constantine [IV], *in the regions of Syria it was not accepted at all*. At this time, however, it was planted by the captives and exiles who, through Arab raids, left [Roman areas] and were settled in Syria. Increasingly, city dwellers, their bishops, and their leaders were corrupted and accepted this doctrine on account of esteem, so to speak, for the Empire of the Romans. Sergius b. Manṣūr, who had greatly persecuted believers [sc. Miaphysites] who were in Damascus and Ḥimṣ, did not only make them conceal the phrase *ὁ σταυρωθείς* from the Trisagion, but carried away many of ours to his heresy. Even the sees of Jerusalem and Antioch and Edessa were corrupted by this heresy, as well as other cities which were held by the Chalcedonians from the time of the Emperor

Heraclius. The monks of Beth Maron and the bishop of the monastery and a few people did not accept this doctrine [sc. Dyothelitism]. But most city dwellers and bishops accepted it; it is still not possible to count or reckon the number of anathemas and quarrels that occurred.²⁷

If Michael is to be believed, a very significant portion of Syria and Palestine had refused to accept Dyothelite theology by the third decade of the eighth century. It was a combination of captives from the Roman Empire, the prestige of the Empire, and Sergius b. Manṣūr's influence that Michael credited with shifting doctrinal allegiance all throughout the Levant and Syria. The monks of Beth Maron, who had spearheaded violence against non-Monothelites and non-Chalcedonians in the seventh century, were counted as doctrinal holdouts, survivals from a past when allegiances had been different. "All the Greeks," the Miaphysite Bar Hebraeus would note in the thirteenth century, "used to confess one will and one activity until the time of Maximus, a monk, and Theodore the Harranian [sc. Abū Qurra] and John Damascene."²⁸

An incomplete shift from Monenergism-Monothelitism to Dyothelitism among the Chalcedonian communities of Greater Syria in the eighth century would have triggered intra-Chalcedonian conflict. Again, Michael provides insight into just what this might have looked like in some places. He reports that a controversy broke out in Aleppo between the two Chalcedonian communities—Maronites and Maximianists²⁹—over the church there. On many occasions, there was even physical fighting going on in the church itself. The dispute was eventually settled by the Muslim emir who ordered each side to take one half of the church, the Maronites getting the eastern half (perhaps because they were the bigger community and the bishop was Maronite)³⁰ and the Maximianists getting the western. A wooden separator was put up

26 For sixth-century Miaphysite and Chalcedonian theologians speaking of one energy in Christ, see Lange, *Mia energieia* (n. 4 above), 417–46.

27 My translation, emphasis added. See *Chronique de Michel le Syrien*, 4:457–58 (2:492–93 trans.).

28 My translation. See F. Nau, ed., *Documents pour servir à l'histoire de l'Église nestorienne*, PO 13.2 (Paris, 1916), 265. (The text is from Base IV of Bar Hebraeus' *Mnārat Qudshē*.)

29 That is, the followers of Maximus the Confessor.

30 Cf. Gribomont, "Documents" (n. 11 above), 121, "ce qui laissait donc aux Maronites la partie la plus noble, et laisse croire qu'ils furent jugés premiers occupants."

between the two parts of the church and a new altar was set up in the western portion. Both groups would have services at the same time and would raise their voices loudly to disturb the other; they would even sometimes scatter their rival's Eucharistic elements about and break their crosses. The Maximianists were an especially tough lot: "Shamelessly, they grabbed the bishop's beard," Michael writes, "and spat in his face."³¹

These conflicts between Dyothelites and Monotheletes in Aleppo were not isolated cases, either. Around 745, the Dyophysite Patriarch of Antioch, Theophylact bar Qanbara, with the backing of the Umayyad Caliph Marwān II, used both violence and large financial penalties in an unsuccessful attempt to force the monks of Beth Maron and the Chalcedonians of Mabbug to accept Maximus's doctrine of the two wills and to use the shorter version of the Trisagion. The situation in Mabbug was defused by the construction of a separate Maronite church, though there was considerable animosity between the Monothelete and Dyothelite communities. What happened in Mabbug, Michael noted, was similar to what had transpired in Aleppo.³²

31 My translation. See *Chronique de Michel le Syrien*, 4:460–61 (2:495 trans.).

32 Ibid., 4:467 (2:511 trans.): "And at this time, Marwan, king of the Arabs, ordered the Chalcedonians and consecrated for them as patriarch Theophylact bar Qanbara, from Harran, who was Marwan's goldsmith. He took a decree from Marwan, and a military force, so that he might persecute the Maronites. When he had come to the Monastery of Maron and was forcing them to accept the heresy of Maximus and to not say 'who was crucified for us,' the monks became weary from his torments and gave him a promise that they would agree with it the next morning. There was with him a certain elderly monk who was beloved by him, and when that monk entered into their church, he pounded on their table of life and said, 'Polluted altar, tomorrow you will be made holy!' At that moment, the wrath of righteousness struck him and a demon entered him and he was thrown down. After being tormented the entire night, he died. Bar Qanbara suffered a great deal and was afraid; he sought to load up the dead man and leave. The monks would not allow him because they feared he might say that they killed him. At that point, he allowed them to bury him and he departed without having carried out his desire. And the Maronites have remained as they are to this day, for they consecrate for themselves a patriarch and bishops from their monastery. They separate from Maximianists in that they confess one will in Christ and say 'who was crucified for us,' but they accept the council of Chalcedon. Bar Qanbara came to Mabbug and began battling with the Chalcedonians who were there, but they would not accept to speak of two wills and did not cease from the expression 'who was crucified.' Therefore, he accused them before Marwan and he fined them four thousand dinars and it was between them as it had been

Michael's testimony suggests that in the early eighth century there were in Greater Syria groups of Chalcedonian Christians who held to the notion that Christ had one energy and one will and that these groups had been numerically superior, at least so far as the Chalcedonian community was concerned. These groups continued to exist in Syria for decades after the Arab conquests took the areas away from the political control of Constantinople; imperial favor or support could not have played a role in the decision of these Christians to adhere to Monenergism or Monothelete Christologies. They were, after all, living under Muslim rule and even, as the case of Marwān II shows, at times in opposition to its doctrinal prescriptions.

When the Emperor Heraclius invoked the doctrine of the one energy as part of his attempt to bring about unity with the Miaphysites in the early seventh century, there were believing Christians who did not find these doctrines objectionable; what these Christians—the monks of Beth Maron—found objectionable, in fact, were views propounded by Maximus the Confessor and others who argued that there were two energies and two wills in the Incarnate Christ.³³ If we take Michael's reports seriously, there were Christians who believed these doctrines strongly enough to resort to violence to defend them and assert their identity. The situation in Syria suggests that Monenergism and, later, Monotheletism, whatever their theological virtues and theological faults, were more than just doctrinal compromises that were tried by an emperor and a handful of prominent churchmen and then found failing.

This should come as no surprise. Although precious few of their own words have survived,³⁴ we have

in Aleppo. Finally, Andrew the Maronite came and built a church for the Maronites, at the order of the king, in Mabbug, and they were separated from the Maximianists, with many shameful things and [?] and horrors taking place between them." (My translation based on Chabot's text, but in consultation with the Syriac in G. Y. Ibrahim, ed., *The Edessa-Aleppo Syriac Codex of the Chronicle of Michael the Great*, vol. 1 of *Texts and Translations of the Chronicle of Michael the Great* [Piscataway, NJ, 2009], 470.) For the date, see above, n. 11.

33 Jankowiak, "Invention of Dyothelitism" (n. 7 above), 339, in fact argues that these two doctrines were not put forth until 641 and that Dyothelitism as a fully formed and articulated theological position actually "was the younger brother of Monotheletism" (342). Jankowiak's points are well made, though his basis for making them is perhaps not as strong as he believes (see below).

34 Winkelmann, *Der monenergetisch-monotheletische Streit*, surveys all the remaining material. CPG 7600–7632 is also a convenient

no evidence that supporters of Monenergism and later, Monotheletism, put forth their doctrines as being new, innovative, or in any way out of consonance with the previous theological tradition; we have no evidence that they portrayed these doctrines primarily as tools aimed at achieving political and ecclesiastical reconciliation. To be sure, they may have been used in such a manner by political and ecclesiastical authorities. But, so too had the definition worked out at the Council of Chalcedon. The question of the use of certain doctrines by imperial and high-level ecclesiastical actors for political ends and the question of the origins of those doctrines are not the same.

History

Let us now move from the first factor, geography, to take up the second: how did Monenergists and, later, Monotheletes speak about themselves and about the way they related to the previous theological tradition? What did they think about their opponents in this regard? Looking at attitudes toward the past will help give us a sense for the open nature of the questions being disputed.³⁵

That Monenergists and, later, Monotheletes understood themselves to be in consonance with the orthodox tradition that preceded them is readily apparent. One of the earliest consciously Monenergist or Monothelete documents in the entire controversy was a letter written by Sergius, Patriarch of Constantinople (sed. 610–638), at some point between 616 and 618, to George Arsas, a Miaphysite, asking him for *testimonia* (χρήσεις) from Christian authorities relating to the doctrine of the one energy. These testimonia would help him, Sergius wrote George, make ecclesiastical union with the Miaphysites.³⁶

inventory of what survives of Monenergist and Monothelete writings in Greek.

35 S. Wessel, “The Politics of Text and Tradition in the Council of Constantinople III (AD 680/1),” *AnnHistCon* 38 (2006): 35–54, in addition to giving a lucid overview of the context and events of the Sixth Council, also provides an insightful discussion of the importance it placed on the past and on authenticating it. More generally, Jankowiak, “Invention of Dyothelitism,” provides a good sense for the fluid nature of the debate over the course of the seventh century.

36 See *Disputatio cum Pyrrho*, PG 91:333A. Both Sergius’s letter and the florilegium that George presumably put together are no longer extant; they are known only through this reference to

Sergius played an important role in the political history of the early seventh century. Made patriarch by Phocas in 610, he would in that very same year crown Heraclius emperor.³⁷ As patriarch of the capital city of an empire at war, he had important issues to grapple with—surviving evidence shows him ordering the movement of relics in the face of Persian invaders,³⁸ and giving a monastery to refugee nuns who had fled to Constantinople from Melitene, again because of the Persians.³⁹ Nevertheless, the later (hostile) Chalcedonian tradition associated Sergius primarily with his attempts to bring about a reunion between Miaphysites and Chalcedonians. Dyotheleites, in fact, would pin the origin of the Monenergist controversy on Sergius’s drive to find a doctrinal solution to the problem of Chalcedon: in the *Disputation with Pyrrhus* (written after 645), Maximus’s short recounting of early Monenergist activities begins with Sergius sending the address of Menas to Theodore of Pharan and the Sixth Council would eventually call Sergius the one who began this false and novel teaching in the church.⁴⁰

But this is certainly not how Sergius viewed himself. “We shall declare, then,” he had written to Cyrus of Phasis in 626 about the question of Christ’s energies, “that in the holy and great ecumenical synods this issue

them by Maximus in his dispute with Pyrrhus. For the date of Sergius’s letter to George, see Winkelmann, *Der monenergetisch-monotheletische Streit*, 52–53 and V. Grumel, *Les Regestes des actes du Patriarcat de Constantinople*, vol. 1, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1972), 214 (no. 280). On what is known of George Arsas, see Winkelmann, *Der monenergetisch-monotheletische Streit*, 206. The fragments of Theodore of Pharan (CPG 7601–2), preserved in the acts of the Lateran Synod of 649 and the acts of the Sixth Council (ACO 2.1:120, 122, 124 and ACO 2.2.2:602, 604, 606) may go back to the late sixth or early seventh century and antedate Sergius’s letter to George. See Winkelmann, *Der monenergetisch-monotheletische Streit*, 50–51 (nos. 8, 8a).

37 See Winkelmann, *Der monenergetisch-monotheletische Streit*, 258–59.

38 Grumel, *Regestes*, 1:221 (no. 293a).

39 H. Delehaye, ed., *Synaxarium ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae e codice Sirmondiano nunc Berolinensi* (Brussels, 1902), col. 883 (August 11). Cf. Grumel, *Regestes*, 1:215 (no. 280b).

40 *Disputatio cum Pyrrho*, PG 91:332C and ACO 2.2.2:582.20–21. But Stephen of Dor called Theodore of Pharan the first Monothelete; for these points, see C. J. Hefele and D. H. Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles d’après les documents originaux*, vol. 3.1 (Paris, 1909), 327. For more on Dyotheleites regarding Theodore of Pharan as the originator of Monenergism, see Winkelmann, *Der monenergetisch-monotheletische Streit*, 51 (under no. 8).

was not raised, nor is it possible to find any definition on this question in any of the orthodox councils.”⁴¹ In this letter, Sergius would invoke venerable teachers to support the position that he was putting forward and promised to attach testimonia supporting the view that Christ’s will and energy are one.⁴² From what is left of his works, we see that Sergius was always scrupulous to give his views on the one energy a pedigree that went back to authorities who preceded him. Sergius was especially fond of an address written by Menas, Patriarch of Constantinople (sed. 536–552), around 552; this address had been accepted by Pope Vigilius (sed. 537–555).⁴³ Crucially, the address had confidently affirmed that Christ had only one will and one operation. “By means of the teaching of the holy fathers,” one of its two surviving fragments reads, “we have shown how the catholic church of God correctly and in piety preaches one will and one operation full of salvation, just as our Lord Jesus Christ is one.”⁴⁴ The other surviving fragment of the address is equally confident and blunt: “Because some people mistakenly say that in our Lord Jesus Christ the will of his divinity is different from that of his humanity,” it read,

Thereby demonstrating that Christ is in opposition to himself, dividing (him) up into God the Word separately and the man separately, we fittingly, being advocates for the truth, are demonstrating by means of testimonies of the holy fathers how, just as Christ is one, God and Man, one and the same, *so too his will is one*.⁴⁵

An explicit testimonium such as this, written by a patriarch of Constantinople and accepted by the bishop of Rome, was of great value; Monenergists and Monothelites would use it with aplomb.

Sergius cited the address in a letter to Theodore of Pharan written around 620;⁴⁶ he cited it in a letter to the Miaphysite Paul the One-Eyed around 622;⁴⁷ he sent a copy of the address to Cyrus of Phasis, in 626, when the latter wrote and asked him about the question of one energy or two.⁴⁸ When discussions with a Miaphysite church leader in Armenia about the number of energies in Christ led Heraclius to write to Sergius for advice on the issue, Sergius included the address in his reply.⁴⁹ In turn, around 632, the Emperor Heraclius wrote Sergius a letter from Edessa, asking him to send the patristic testimonia (χρήσεις) used in the address.⁵⁰

The sixth-century address of Menas to Pope Vigilius was a favorite of others beside Sergius. Sergius’s

41 Translation P. Allen in eadem, *Sophronius of Jerusalem and Seventh-Century Heresy: The Synodical Letter and Other Documents* (Oxford, 2009): 165. ACO 2.2.2:528.10–12; Grumel, *Regestes*, 1:216–17 (no. 285); Winkelmann, *Der monenergetisch-monothelische Streit*, 58 (no. 20). A similar point was made by Theodore, the Bishop of Melitene, in the eighth session of the Sixth Council: ACO 2.2.1:202.13–19. In the same eighth session, Macarius of Antioch, a Monothelite, was careful to affirm that he accepted the first five councils: see ACO 2.2.1:228.1–5. Compare this with Thomas of Kfarṭāb in the eleventh century, who was careful to point out to his Dyothelite opponent that he accepted the first five councils; he also pointed out: “The Councils never mentioned the two wills at all because this is an extra expression which Maximus stated; it has no witness” (my translation). See C. Chartouni, ed. and trans., *Le traité des dix chapitres de Thomas de Kfarṭāb: Un document sur les origines de l’Église maronite* (Beirut, 1986): 17 (Arabic; 83 French trans.); reference to councils, *ibid.* 17 (82 trans.).

42 ACO 2.2.2:528.13–23; Sergius cited Cyril of Alexandria and Menas of Constantinople (see below). See Allen, *Sophronius of Jerusalem*, 165, for an English translation.

43 See Grumel, *Regestes*, 1:176 (no. 243) and Winkelmann, *Der monenergetisch-monothelische Streit*, 45–46 (no. 1).

44 Trans. S. P. Brock, “A Monothelite Florilegium in Syriac,” in *After Chalcedon: Studies in Theology and Church History Offered to Professor Albert Van Roey for His Seventieth Birthday*, ed. C. Laga, J. A. Munitiz, and L. van Rompay (Leuven, 1985), 37–38.

45 Emphasis added. Trans. Brock, “Monothelite Florilegium,” 37.

46 *Disputatio cum Pyrrho*, PG 91:332C, Grumel, *Regestes*, 1:215 (no. 281) and Winkelmann, *Der monenergetisch-monothelische Streit*, 53 (no. 10).

47 *Disputatio cum Pyrrho*, PG 91:332–33. Grumel, *Regestes*, 1:215 (no. 282); Winkelmann, *Der monenergetisch-monothelische Streit*, 55 (no. 13).

48 *Disputatio cum Pyrrho*, PG 91:333B (cf. ACO 2.2.2:528.15–19). See Grumel, *Regestes*, 1:216–17 (no. 285); Winkelmann, *Der monenergetisch-monothelische Streit*, 53 (no. 10a).

49 ACO 2.2.2:536.7–11.

50 ACO 2.2.2:546.1–5; Grumel, *Regestes*, 1:217 (no. 286); Winkelmann, *Der monenergetisch-monothelische Streit*, 60 (no. 22). Note that the second of the two Syriac fragments of the address that survive begins, “After providing the testimonies of the fathers he [Menas] said as follows . . .” Trans. Brock, “Monothelite Florilegium,” 37. Although this correspondence between Sergius and Heraclius is no longer extant, we know about it because Sergius referenced his interactions with Heraclius and the role of the address in them in yet another piece of correspondence, a letter he wrote to Pope Honorius in late 633 or early 634. For the letter to Honorius, see ACO 2.2.2:534–46; for discussion and dating, see Grumel, *Regestes*, 1:219–20 (no. 291) and Winkelmann, *Der monenergetisch-monothelische Streit*, 77–78 (no. 43).

successor as Patriarch of Constantinople, Pyrrhus, was fond of it as well. He cited it in a letter he wrote to Pope John IV (sed. 640–642) in 641.⁵¹ In his celebrated dispute with Maximus, held in Carthage in 645, Pyrrhus would invoke the famous address and the authority and reputation of the Roman church to support his position:

How then could Vigilius, the bishop at that time presiding over the Roman Church, accept that the *Libellus* issued by Menas at the imperial capital and shown to him at the imperial council chamber, and which said that Christ had one will?⁵²

Monenergists and Monotheletes, of course, relied on more than just the address of Menas to give their views historical legitimacy: they had other proof texts in their arsenal. Menas had written to Vigilius with a statement of faith, but Vigilius himself had written a statement of faith, too, which was also pertinent to the Monenergist cause; this address was sent to the Emperor Justinian. “Whoever does not confess that God the word was incarnate,” the Pope had written, “that is to say Christ, that he is a single hypostasis and a single person and a *single operation*, him we anathematize.”⁵³ When Heraclius had presented Miaphysite bishops in Mabbug a theological document as the basis of union between Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians, Michael the Great described the emperor’s actions in the following way: “He requested from them that they give him the Eucharist and that they accept the text he had composed, which confessed two natures united in Christ and one will and one activity, ‘like Cyril,’ he said.”⁵⁴ Heraclius presented his doctrine as Cyrillian because this was how

one made a theological argument: one argued using tradition as a support. “Who among approved teachers,” Maximus asked Theodore, Bishop of Bithynian Caesarea in a debate in 656, “says ‘one energy?’”⁵⁵ In response, Theodore, the text of the dispute tells us, read testimonia from Julian of Rome, Gregory the Wonderworker, Athanasius, John Chrysostom, and Cyril of Alexandria.⁵⁶

Maximus’s question was one that anyone making a theological point would have to be able to answer. And, from what slender evidence remains, it is clear that Monenergists and, later, Monotheletes invoked a variety of different authorities attempting to make their case or support their beliefs: Gregory Nazianzen,⁵⁷ Gregory Nyssen,⁵⁸ Leo I,⁵⁹ (Ps-) Athanasius,⁶⁰ Athanasius,⁶¹ and Cyril of Alexandria;⁶²

55 My translation. *Disputatio Bizae*, 99.274–75 (CPG 7735) in P. Allen and B. Neil, eds., *Scripta saeculi VII vitam Maximi Confessoris illustrantia una cum latina interpretatio Anastasii Bibliothecarii iuxta posita* (Turnhout-Leuven, 1999), 99: Καὶ τίς λέγει μίαν ἐνέργειαν τῶν ἐγκρίτων διδασκάλων; Compare with Constantine IV’s order to Macarius of Antioch and his Monothelete associates in the third session of the Sixth Council, ACO 2.2.1:44.20–24: Μακάριος ὁ ὁσιώτατος ἀρχιεπίσκοπος καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ διεξίτωσαν, εἰ κατὰ τὰ παρ’ αὐτῶν ὑποσχεθέντα ἐτοιμῶς ἔχουσι χρήσεις προαγαγεῖν ἀγίων ἐκκρίτων πατέρων ὀφειλοῦσας ἀποδείξαι, ὅπερ ὑπέσχοντο, ἐν θέλημα καὶ μίαν ἐνέργειαν ἐπὶ τῆς ἐνσάρκου οἰκονομίας τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ ταύτας προκομιζέτωσαν.

56 *Disputatio Bizae*, 99.276–78, 285–86; 101.296–98, Allen and Neil, *Scripta saeculi VII*.

57 *Disputatio cum Pyrrho*, PG 91:316D. Also, cf. PG 91:296B; Theodore of Constantinople, *Quaestiones quibus respondet Maximus*, PG 91:216C (CPG 7632).

58 *Disputatio cum Pyrrho*, PG 91:316D–17A. Also see Sergius of Constantinople, *ep. ad Honoriam papam*, ACO 2.2.2:544.3–8 and Macarius of Antioch at the Sixth Council, ACO 2.2.1:224.19–24 (the same passage that is cited by Macarius is cited in a Dyothelite florilegium connected to the Lateran Synod of 649. See ACO 2.1:428, no. 28 and Riedinger’s comments, ACO 2.2.2:XII).

59 *Disputatio cum Pyrrho*, PG 91:296D (cf. G. Bausenhardt, “In allem uns gleich ausser der Sünde”: Studien zum Beitrag Maximus’ des Bekenntners zur altkirchlichen Christologie; Mit einer kommentierten Übersetzung der “Disputatio cum Pyrrho” [Mainz, 1992], 242, no. 15). Also see Sergius of Constantinople, *ep. ad Cyrum ep. Phas.*, ACO 2.2.2:528.24–25; idem, *ep. ad Honorium papam*, ACO 2.2.2:546.16–17.

60 *Disputatio cum Pyrrho*, PG 91:318B (cf. Bausenhardt, “In allem uns gleich ausser der Sünde,” 255–56, no. 36.).

61 *Disputatio cum Pyrrho*, PG 91:320B (cf. Bausenhardt, “In allem uns gleich ausser der Sünde,” 256–57, no. 38). See, too, Theodore of Constantinople, *Quaestiones quibus respondet Maximus*, PG 91:216C (CPG 7632).

62 *Disputatio cum Pyrrho*, PG 91:344B. Cf. also *Disputatio Bizyae*, 101.297–98 in Allen and Neil, *Scripta saeculi VII*.

51 *Disputatio cum Pyrrho*, PG 91:328B. English translation in J. P. Farrell, *The Disputation with Pyrrhus of our Father among the Saints, Maximus the Confessor* (South Canaan, PA, 1990), 48. See also Grumel, *Regestes*, 1:224–25 (no. 296) and Winkelmann, *Der monenergetisch-monotheletische Streit*, 99 (no. 70).

52 Trans. Farrell, *Disputation with Pyrrhus*, 48. Greek text in PG 91:328A.

53 Emphasis added. Trans. Brock, “Monothelete Florilegium,” 36. The Latin text of this letter from Vigilius to Justinian can be found in J. Straub, ed., *Concilium Universale Constantinopolitanum sub Justiniano Habitu*, vol. 1, ACO 4.1 (Berlin, 1971), 187–88. See esp. 187.31–32.

54 My translation. See *Chronique de Michel le Syrien*, 4:410 (2:412 trans.).

even Augustine's words would be drawn in to support the doctrine of the one energy or one will.⁶³ Long after the debates had ended and Monenergists and Monotheletes had lost in the controversy, the memory persisted among non-Dyothelites that it was Monenergists and Monotheletes who had had the support of the Christian past on their side. "Macarius of Antioch," Michael the Great, a Miaphysite, reported in his account of the Sixth Council, "disputed with them [sc. Dyothelites] in many things, with testimonia from Cyril. And he showed clearly that it was a heresy that two wills and energies be spoken of in Christ."⁶⁴

Maximus's question about patristic support might also be turned against Dyothelites as well for, as Sergius had pointed out, the question of the number of energies in Christ was not one that had yet been authoritatively discussed by the Church. Around 645, Macarius of Antioch wrote a treatise for Luke, a monk living in North Africa, about the "new" heresy of the party of Maximus.⁶⁵ Theodore of Constantinople would likewise lay down the following challenge to Dyothelites. If every expression not spoken by the Fathers is an innovation, there were two options: show that the Fathers used the expression "natural wills" or, unable to do so, admit that they have been using the name of the Fathers to introduce their own novel teaching.⁶⁶

63 Macarius of Antioch, *Confessio fidei*, ACO 2.2.1:216.19–21. Although Macarius explicitly cites Augustine, Riedinger, the text's editor, was unable to locate the passage in any of Augustine's works. See also the letter from Patriarch Paul II (sed. 641–653) to Pope Theodore in which Paul cites a number of patristic authorities to support his Monothelete beliefs (ACO 2.1:196.16–37 and 204.1–9; cf. Grumel, *Regestes*, 1:228, no. 300).

64 My translation. See *Chronique de Michel le Syrien*, 4:434 (2:452 trans.). Michael may have been drawing upon a source written around A.D. 806. See Chabot's comment: 2:453, n. 1.

65 The content of the treatise does not survive; only its title does. See ACO 2.2.1:504.1–15. Λόγος ἀποσταλὲς ὑπὸ Μακαρίου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Θεουπόλεως Λουκᾶ πρεσβυτέρου καὶ μοναχῶ τῷ Ἀφρικῆς γράψαντι περὶ τῆς καινῆς τῶν Μαξιμιανῶν αἱρέσεως. NB: Riedinger, the editor, supplied <καινῆς> from the Latin translation of the acta, which speaks of the work being "de noua herese Maximianorum." Also see Winkelmann, *Der monenergetisch-monotheletische Streit* (n. 23 above), 137 (no. 129); for the date, see 113–14 (no. 92a).

66 Theodore of Constantinople, *Quaestiones quibus respondet Maximus*, PG 91:216D–17A. See Winkelmann, *Der monenergetisch-monotheletische Streit*, 109 (no. 85). Compare the Monothelete Thomas of Kafarṭāb in the eleventh century: "Where have you seen and heard in all the spiritual books of the Church their saying 'Your

We do not, Maximus noted in his response, introduce novel words as our opponents allege: "Rather, we agree with patristic expressions."⁶⁷ But all parties claimed to be patristic in inspiration. "Closely following the Holy Fathers in all things and in this," the *Ekthesis* of 638 declared, "we confess one will of our Lord Jesus Christ, the true God."⁶⁸ A seventh- or eighth-century palimpsest from the new finds at Dayr al-Suryān in Egypt contains what is apparently a set of objections to the Sixth Council written by someone who took part; speaking, perhaps sarcastically, of "the fine Sixth Council of yours," the fragmentary undertext also makes reference to "the faith of the Holy Fathers which these people have corrupted."⁶⁹ A large part of the Monenergist-Monothelete controversy was a struggle over the authority of the past.

This can be seen by looking briefly at the role of florilegia in the controversy. By the seventh century, it was standard practice for Christians seeking to defend a doctrine to compile and use florilegia to make their case; it was something they had been doing for hundreds of years.⁷⁰ Monenergists and Monotheletes

wills—of your divinity and of your humanity?" (my translation). See Chartouni, *Traité*, 23 (Arabic = 89 French trans.).

67 My translation. *Quaestiones quibus respondet Maximus*, PG 91:224D. Maximus responded to the two *aporias* of Theodore in a letter to Marinus the Presbyter, on whom see Winkelmann, *Der monenergetisch-monotheletische Streit*, 235–36. Compare this to fourth-century polemics between Athanasius and his opponents over the (non-) use of key phrases such as ὁμοούσιος, ἐξ οὗκ ὄντων, and ἦν ποτε, ὅτε οὐκ ἦν in Scripture and previous tradition as reflected in, e.g., Athanasius, *Epist. Ad Afros*, 6.

68 My translation. ACO 2.1:160.24–26. See Winkelmann, *Der monenergetisch-monotheletische Streit*, 85–86 (no. 50). An English translation of the entire *Ekthesis* is available in Allen, *Sophronius of Jerusalem* (n. 41 above), 209–17.

69 Trans. S. P. Brock with my alterations. Dayr al-Suryān Fragment 88. Text and translation in S. P. Brock and L. van Rompay, *Catalogue of the Syriac Manuscripts and Fragments in the Library of Deir al-Surian, Wadi al-Natrun (Egypt)*, Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 227 (Leuven, 2014), 426–27. Brock suggests that the text was written possibly by someone who attended the council. I am grateful to Sebastian Brock for making this fragment known to me.

70 See Henry Chadwick's article, "Florilegium," in *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, vol. 7, ed. T. Klauser (Stuttgart, 1969), cols. 1131–60. The first explicit evidence for florilegia made by Christians from Christian (as opposed to pagan) texts was a Biblical florilegium of Cyprian's in the third century, though there may have been earlier collections of Christian Biblical testimonia (cols. 1146–48). The first evidence we have of Christian florilegia which comprised non-Biblical Christian texts is the work of the Cappadocians in the fourth century

were no different in this respect. “God knows, my brother,” Bishop Theodosius told Maximus after the latter challenged the authenticity of his patristic citations, “that these testimonia (χρήσεις) were given to me by the patriarch.”⁷¹ The patriarch to whom Theodosius was referring was Peter of Constantinople (sed. 654–666); only a short time after Theodosius’s debate with Maximus, Peter himself wrote a letter to Pope Vitalian in which he offered patristic support for Monothelete belief.⁷² Peter was following a well-trodden Monenergist and Monothelete path when he composed his letter. The surviving fragments of the address of Menas, which I cited above, refer to “testimonies” and “demonstrations” of the “holy fathers,”⁷³ but because the full text of the address does not survive, we do not know which fathers Menas had in mind. It was these (now unknown) patristic citations that Heraclius was interested in when he wrote to Sergius in 632 and asked him for the testimonia used by Menas.⁷⁴ Similarly, before Heraclius and perhaps even before Sergius (but after Menas), Theodore of Pharan, a Chalcedonian, wrote a treatise in the late sixth or early seventh century *On the Interpretation of Patristic Testimonia*. The testimonia that Theodore discussed are no longer extant—all that is left of the text are passages where Theodore affirmed one energy

in the Incarnate Christ, passages that were read out in the thirteenth session of the Sixth Council.⁷⁵ Given the title of his work, however, Theodore’s assertions about the number of energies in Christ must have been connected to his reading of venerated figures from the past.

At some point the patristic authorities invoked by Menas and Theodore of Pharan, like those compiled by George of Arsas, must have been gathered into collections which could have been used by proponents of the doctrine of the one energy or, later, the one will. We can see the faint shadow of these collections in our few surviving Monothelete and Monenergist writings; we see the shadow more clearly in the acta of the Lateran Synod of 649 and of the Sixth Council of 680–681. In the fifth session of the Sixth Council, Emperor Constantine IV ordered that two codices of patristic testimonia (χρήσεις) brought by Macarius, patriarch of Antioch and the leading Monothelete at the Council, be read out. The title of the first codex, the acta inform us, was “Testimonia (χρήσεις) of the Holy Fathers who teach one will of the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, which [will] is also that of the Father and the Holy Spirit.”⁷⁶ In the sixth session of the Council, Macarius produced a third codex of testimonia, a sequel to the first two books.⁷⁷

Until 1985, our only explicit evidence for Monothelete florilegia was in references from hostile sources such as these acta.⁷⁸ In that year, however, Brock published excerpts from a Monothelete florilegium preserved in a ninth-century Syriac manuscript in the British Library (Add. 14,535). Brock published only the testimonia of sixth-century writers: one text from Pope Vigilius, two excerpts from the address of Menas, Patriarch of Constantinople, one text from Emperor

(cols. 1149–50). Chadwick’s article is now available in an English translation: “Some Ancient Anthologies and Florilegia, Pagan and Christian” in idem, *Studies on Ancient Christianity* (Aldershot, 2006), no. XIX. For florilegia and post-Chalcedonian Christological controversy, see A. Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 2, pt. 1, *From Chalcedon to Justinian I*, trans. P. Allen (Atlanta, 1987), 51–77. P. Gray, “‘The Select Fathers’: Canonizing the Patristic Past,” *StP* 23 (1989): 21–36, discusses the development of the idea that the opinions of certain Fathers and groups of Fathers were especially authoritative in theological debate. More generally, Marcel Richard was the master of the genre of florilegia. See for instance his “Florilèges spirituels grecs” (reprinted as article 1 in *Opera Minora*, vol. 1 [Turnhout-Leuven, 1976]), “Notes sur les florilèges dogmatiques du V^e et du VI^e siècle” (= article 2 in *Opera Minora*, vol. 1) and “Les florilèges diphysites du V^e et du VI^e siècle” (= article 3 in *Opera Minora*, vol. 1).

71 My translation. *Disputatio Bizyae*, 101.294–295. See also Winkelmann, *Der monenergetisch-monotheletische Streit*, 149, no. 145a.

72 The text of the letter is now lost, but see Grumel, *Regestes*, 1:232 (no. 303) and Winkelmann, *Der monenergetisch-monotheletische Streit*, 149 (no. 145a).

73 Brock’s translations with my alteration. See frag 1 and 2 in Brock “Monothelete Florilegium,” 37.

74 Grumel, *Les Regestes*, 1:217 (no. 286). See above, n. 50.

75 See ACO 2.2.2:604.5–606.14. NB 604.4: Τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ λόγου, ὅς <ν> περ ἐποίησεν εἰς τὰς ἐρμηνείας τῶν πατρικῶν χρήσεων. See Winkelmann, *Der monenergetisch-monotheletische Streit*, 51 (no. 8a), for the date, see 50–51 (no. 8).

76 My translation. See ACO 2.2.1:168.5–14; Winkelmann, *Der monenergetisch-monotheletische Streit*, 136, (no. 127a.)

77 See ACO 2.2.1:176.14–18; Winkelmann, *Der monenergetisch-monotheletische Streit*, 136 (no. 127b).

78 One possible exception is the *Libellus fidei* of John Maron, which I discuss below. It contains a Monothelete passage in its florilegium, but the testimonia assembled in it are not collected for the sole purpose of defending a Monenergist or Monothelete doctrinal stance.

Justinian, two texts from Anastasius, patriarch of Antioch, and two texts from Symeon Stylites the Younger. The florilegium also contains material from two more authors that Brock did not publish: an extract from the *Ekthesis* of Heraclius and lengthy quotations from a Chalcedonian figure named George the Monk.⁷⁹ The passages written by George the Monk have recently been edited by Maria Conterno and were excerpted from three otherwise unknown texts.⁸⁰ Similarly, all of the texts that Brock published, save the text of Pope Vigilius, are extant nowhere else. Brock, however, argued persuasively that they should be viewed as authentic.⁸¹ The unique nature of nearly all the texts contained in Brock's florilegium point to an important limitation that distorts discussions of the Monenergist-Monothelite controversy: medieval Dyothelite churches did not copy and transmit Monothelite passages in authors who were otherwise considered orthodox.⁸² Explicitly Monenergist or Monothelite texts, at least in their original Greek, have not been independently transmitted at all: a number

of Monothelite texts, for example, were burned in the thirteenth session of the Sixth Council.⁸³

When they were in power, however, Monothelites had done precisely the same sort of thing. An unremarkable Dyothelite statement of faith written at some point in the middle of the seventh century by Euthalius, a bishop from Sardinia, contains one very remarkable passage: an admission from Euthalius that he had previously signed a confession against Maximus, under duress, in the context of violent searches that were being carried out by authorities for the works of Maximus.⁸⁴

Brock's precious florilegium and the lost voices it contains raise a question about perspectives: what was the Miaphysite position during this controversy? Because the Sixth Council was a Chalcedonian affair and because almost all of the writings we possess about the Monenergist-Monothelite controversy come from the hands of (Dyothelite) Chalcedonians,⁸⁵ it is easy to forget the obvious: Monenergism was a doctrine which was supposed to have what might be termed "crossover

79 Brock, "Monothelite Florilegium," 35–36.

80 See M. Conterno, "Three Unpublished Texts on Christ's Unique Will and Operation from the Syriac Florilegium in the ms. London, British Library, Add. 14535," *Millennium* 10 (2013): 115–44. The texts are an excerpt from a *memra* against Severus and Julian, an excerpt from a work written to Abraham, Bishop of Resapha, and an excerpt from a work written about Christ's energies. Brock, "Monothelite Florilegium," 44, n. 21, suggests that this George was a seventh-century figure; Conterno, 138–39, tentatively suggests placing him in the years 630–40, but is ultimately uncertain about George's time of writing. Another possible identification might be with a certain seventh-century George the Monk and Presbyter. Concerning this George, see CPG 7820–22 and M. Richard, "La traité de Georges hiéromoine sur les hérésies," *REB* 28 (1970): 239–69; for his writing against the followers of Severus of Antioch, Theodosius of Alexandria, Jacobites, Tritheists, Julian of Halicarnassus, and Gaianus of Alexandria see 266–67.

81 Brock, "Monothelite Florilegium," 37–43. By referring to the "authenticity" of these passages, I am saying merely that they contain the words of the authors to whom they are ascribed; this is not to anachronistically impute to these authors fully-formed Monothelite or Monenergist views that develop only in the seventh century.

82 But, apart from references in acta, Dyothelites did at times transmit passages in approved authors that sat uncomfortably with their views, if only to explain how seemingly Monenergist passages in fact were not. Such is the case, for example, with the handful of passages Maximus discusses in *Opuscula theologica et polemica* 20 (*Dogmatic Tome to Marinus the Priest*), PG 91:228–45; French translation in E. Ponsoye, *Saint Maxime le Confesseur: Opuscules théologiques et polémiques* (Paris, 1998), 239–50.

83 See ACO 2.2.2:626.14–19. Cf. *ibid.*, XVI. On the destruction of Monothelite texts, see W. Brandes, "Orthodoxy and Heresy in the Seventh Century: Prosopographical Observations on Monothelitism," in *Fifty Years of Prosopography: The Later Roman Empire, Byzantium and Beyond*, ed. Av. Cameron (Oxford and New York, 2003), 109.

84 Winkelmann, *Der monenergetisch-monothelische Streit*, 157 (no. 154a). For the date of this text and an English translation of the relevant section, see Brandes, "Orthodoxy and Heresy in the Seventh Century," 109–10. For Euthalius's reference to violent searches and his condemnation of his earlier anathematization of Maximus, see H. F. von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt* 1.1 (Berlin, 1902), 641.

85 There are a few exceptions. Michael the Great relates a hostile account of the Sixth Council, one that is sympathetic to Monothelites. See *Chronique de Michel le Syrien*, 4:433–35 (2:451–53 trans.). This account may go back to the early ninth century (AD 806), see 2:453, n. 1. T. Greenwood summarizes the hostile Miaphysite take on Maximus and his followers, the Lateran Synod of 649 and the Sixth Council, written in Armenian in the late seventh century and contained in the *Anonymous Chronicle* (or *Chronicle of Ananias of Shirak*) in "New Light from the East: Chronography and Ecclesiastical History through a Late Seventh-Century Armenian Source," *JEChrSt* 16 (2008): 245–47. Greenwood holds out the possibility that underlying the *Anonymous Chronicle's* description of the church councils is a now-lost Miaphysite work, originally composed in Greek. S. P. Brock, "A Syriac Fragment on the Sixth Council," *OC* 57 (1973): 63–71, represents a set of Monothelite objections to the Sixth Council, and Dayr al-Suryān Fragment 88 (see n. 69, above) also represents what is apparently a Monothelite perspective on the Sixth Council.

appeal.” It was supposed to satisfy the theological worries of both Chalcedonians and Miaphysites—the *Pact of Union* of 633 had been between Chalcedonians in Alexandria and the Miaphysites there who adhered to the tradition of Severus’s follower Theodosius of Alexandria.

We do not know the precise contents of the three different florilegia produced by Macarius of Antioch at the Sixth Council, but all the authors cited in Brock’s florilegium were Chalcedonians.⁸⁶ It is not clear, however, that the name of Emperor Justinian or that of a successor of Leo I would be persuasive with Miaphysites in attempts to find theological common ground and basis for reunion—judging by this consideration of audience, by the time Brock’s florilegium was composed the debate over Monenergism and Monotheletism seems to have become an intra-Chalcedonian one. But what was the theological incentive or lure of Monotheletism or, more importantly, Monenergism,⁸⁷ from a Miaphysite perspective during the reign of Heraclius? Political considerations aside, what theological justification for ecclesiastical reconciliation would the Miaphysites of Alexandria have given when they agreed to the *Pact of Union* in 633?

Pre-Chalcedonian theological authorities respected by both Miaphysites and Chalcedonians would have no doubt been mobilized in support of the union. The existence of Dyothelite collections of heretical florilegia highlighting post-Chalcedonian Miaphysite writers’ use of one-energy or one-will language also suggests that Miaphysites would have been inclined toward

sympathy for Monenergism because it also formed part of their specific theological heritage.⁸⁸

Among authorities respected by both Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians and who might be cited to buttress a Monenergist stance, none was perhaps as important as Dionysius the Areopagite, then thought to be the first-century bishop of Athens. Dionysius was fertile ground for ideas that might bring both Chalcedonians and Miaphysites together: since the early sixth century, his works had been invoked by nearly every party on both sides of the Chalcedonian divide as supporting their Christological position.⁸⁹ In fact, one of the earliest references to the corpus of Dionysius’s writings can be found in an excerpt of Severus of Antioch’s *Third Letter to John the Superior* preserved in the seventh-century *Doctrina Patrum*; interestingly enough, the fragment in question cites the last line of the *Fourth Letter to Gaius*, an important passage I will discuss below.⁹⁰ Fragments from another sixth-century Miaphysite, Themistius of Alexandria,

86 With this said, however, it should also be pointed out that some of the testimonia used by Macarius were read out in the eighth and ninth sessions of the Sixth Council (cf. ACO 2.2.1:232.15–16) in order to show that he had taken them out of context. As a result, we have a sense for at least part of the content of his florilegia. Most of the authorities cited were pre-Chalcedonian (or thought to be so), but orthodox. These included: testimonia from (Ps.-) Athanasius *De incarnatione contra Apollinarium* (cf. e.g. ACO 2.2.1:234.2–13), Ambrose of Milan, *De Fide II* (ACO 2.2.1:248.18–30), Ps.-Dionysius, *De divinis nominibus* (ACO 2.2.1:252.4–8), (Ps.-) John Chrysostom, *in illud: Pater, si possibile est* (ACO 2.2.1:252.12–14), (Ps.-) Athanasius, *De incarnatione* (ACO 2.2.1:268.22, 24–270.3), and Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentarii in Mattheum XII* (ACO 2.2.1:272.7–8).

87 Since the notion of the one energy and not the one will had played a role in attempts at theological reunion. Jankowiak’s attempt, “Invention of Dyothelitism” (n. 7 above), 337, to downplay the importance of the notion of the one energy or the one theandric energy in efforts at union, though creative, is not persuasive.

88 A codex, for example, containing some forty-eight Dyothelite patristic testimonia that was read out in the tenth session of the Sixth Council also contained a number of testimonia from heretical writers showing that these figures supported the idea that Christ had one energy or one will. Almost all the authorities cited—Themistius, the deacon of Alexandria, Anthimus of Trebizond, Severus of Antioch, Theodosius of Alexandria, Paul of Antioch, Theodore of Alexandria—were leading Miaphysite figures of the sixth century and would have been respected by Miaphysites in the seventh. See ACO 2.2.1:370–90 (CPG 9429). The only exception is a single text from Apollinaris (ACO 2.2.2:388.22–390.4), but the circulation of Apollinarian forgeries under names like Gregory the Wonderworker, Athanasius, or Pope Julius I, and the use of these texts by Miaphysites is well known. Similar conclusions about Miaphysite use of one-energy or one-will language can be drawn from heretical florilegia preserved in the seventh-century *Doctrina Patrum* (F. Diekamp, ed., *Doctrina Patrum de incarnatione verbi: Ein griechisches Florilegium aus der Wende des 7. und 8. Jahrhunderts*, 2nd ed. [Münster, 1981], 302–15 [Chapter 40]) and also in the acts of the Lateran Synod of 649 (see ACO 2.1:320.21–332.12), which include texts by Miaphysites such as Severus of Antioch, Irenaeus of Harpasus, Colluthus, Themistius of Alexandria, Theodosius of Alexandria, and Julian of Halicarnassus. As I pointed out above (n. 9), Lange, *Mia energieia*, 417–28, discusses sixth-century Miaphysite theologians who spoke of the one energy.

89 See P. Rorem and J. C. Lamoreaux, *John of Scythopolis and the Dionysian Corpus: Annotating the Areopagite* (Oxford, 1998), 18–22, esp. 19.

90 See Diekamp, *Doctrina Patrum*, 309 (no. XXIV). For discussion, see Rorem and Lamoreaux, *John of Scythopolis*, 13–15, English translation on 14.

show that he too relied on the authority of Dionysius to assert one energy in the incarnate Christ.⁹¹ In the sixth century, a presbyter named Theodore would write a treatise upholding the authenticity of Dionysius's works against four very cogent objections;⁹² it has been suggested that this Theodore the Presbyter may have in fact been none other than Theodore of Pharan, the important early Monenergist.⁹³

Dionysius was especially dear to Monenergists and Monotheletes because in the last line of his fourth letter (to Gaius) he had spoken of a "theandric energy" (θεανδρικὴν ἐνέργειαν)—a "God-man" activity or operation—in the Incarnate Christ.⁹⁴ "I saw a terrifying man," Polychronius, a Monothelete monk, would explain to the fifteenth session of the Sixth Council. "His clothes were exceedingly white, and he stood before me saying, 'He who does not confess one will and theandric energy is not a Christian.'"⁹⁵ For many, the apparent source of their Monenergist faith had been the testimony of the Fathers, but for Polychronius, it was this vision he had had at about the seventh hour of the day, a vision whose source he apparently thought was God.⁹⁶ When God had revealed what it meant to be a Christian, he did so using the Areopagite's words.

91 See ACO 2.1:144.35–146.22. Citation of Dionysius at 144.39–40. Themistius also cites Severus's discussion on the nature of that energy (146.5–7).

92 See Photius, *Bibliotheca* (cod. 1).

93 See G. Röwekamp's short article "Theodore of Raithu/Pharan," in *Dictionary of Early Christian Literature*, ed. S. Döpp and W. Geerlings, trans. M. O'Connell (New York, 2000), 565, and cf. O. Bardenhewer's comments, *Geschichte der Altkirchlichen Literatur*, vol. 4 (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1924), 296.

94 Dionysius Areopagita, *Ep. 4 ad Gaium* (G. Heil and A. M. Ritter, eds., *Corpus Dionysiacum*, vol. 2, *De coelesti hierarchia, De ecclesiastica hierarchia, De mystica theologia, Epistulae*, Patristische Texte und Studien 36 [Berlin and New York, 1991], 161 = PG 3:1072). Bausenhart, "In allem uns gleich ausser der Sünde" (n. 59 above), 303–9 thoroughly discusses the phrase in the context of the controversy. Dyotheletes read this key passage differently from some Monotheletes, as καὶνὴν τινὰ τὴν θεανδρικὴν ἐνέργειαν, a certain new theandric energy, rather than one, μίαν, theandric energy, and this disagreement over the reading was a crucial point of difference between Monenergist-Monotheletes and Dyotheletes. See further discussion of this point below. R. Price, "Monothelism: A Heresy or a Form of Words?" *StP* 48 (2010), 221, is helpful in understanding what was meant by "energy."

95 My translation. The line comes from Polychronius's statement of faith, which was read out at the council. See ACO 2.2.2:676.16–18.

96 ACO 2.2.2:676.2.

So confident was Polychronius in his Monenergist and Monothelete beliefs that he told the council he would give his statement of faith to a dead person and pray to the Son of God to resurrect him. If the resurrection did not occur, Polychronius said, the Council and the emperor could do with him as they pleased.⁹⁷ Polychronius, the synod, and a great crowd decamped to the Baths of Zeuxippus, where the monk placed his statement of faith over a corpse and spent hours whispering to him. When no resurrection occurred, Polychronius was forced to admit, "I am unable to raise the dead man."⁹⁸ Jeers and anathemas poured down. Questioned about his beliefs, Polychronius held firm: just as he had placed in his writing over the dead man, he again declared, "in this way I believe: 'One will and theandric energy.' Other than this I do not say."⁹⁹

Even though it failed to raise the dead in the Sixth Council, Dionysius's notion of a theandric energy was apparently ubiquitous in Monenergist and Monothelete thought. It was a favorite text in the Monenergist arsenal from the very beginning. The last line of the fourth letter was invoked in the carefully crafted *Pact of Union* between Chalcedonians and Miaphysites in Alexandria in 633,¹⁰⁰ a document that had delicately sought to satisfy both Chalcedonian and Miaphysite theological worries.¹⁰¹ Crucially, the *Pact of Union* condemned anyone who did not confess that "one and the same Christ and Son performed things befitting God and things human by means of 'one theandric energy,' in

97 ACO 2.2.2:674.12–14.

98 My translation. ACO 2.2.2:678.16.

99 My translation. ACO 2.2.2:680.5–6.

100 Referred to as Theodosians, for Theodosius of Alexandria (d. 566). The CPG (7613) gives the Pact of Union the rather cumbersome name *Satisfactio facta inter Cyrum et eos qui errant ex parte Theodosianorum*. See Allen, *Sophronius of Jerusalem* (n. 41 above), 13–14, for a discussion of the various names by which this document is called in English.

101 The document had appealed to the authority of Cyril of Alexandria in declaring that Christ was both out of two natures and in two natures; it also affirmed that there was one nature of God the word incarnate. Hefele and Leclercq, *Histoire*, 341 point out the specific language employed in the text which aimed to appeal to Miaphysites. For the text of the *Pact of Union*, see ACO 2.2.2:594.17–600.20; see also Winkelmann, *Der monenergetisch-monotheletische Streit*, 66–67 (no. 27). An English translation of the *Pact of Union* is available in Allen, *Sophronius of Jerusalem*, 169–73.

accordance with Dionysius, who is among the saints.”¹⁰² Although Sergius of Constantinople had been making Monenergist overtures in hopes of reconciliation with Miaphysites since the second decade of the seventh century,¹⁰³ it was this act of union in 633, undertaken by Cyrus, which successfully accomplished the theological and ecclesiastical reconciliation that had eluded Chalcedonians for centuries. It was this act of union, too, that ignited the Monenergist-Monothelite controversy. Lying behind the spark that set the conflagration were the words of the Areopagite.

Sergius was elated at the news of the rift being healed and he expressed his excitement in Dionysian language. In a letter written to Cyrus in 633, only a few months after the ecclesiastical reconciliation, the patriarch of Constantinople used almost the exact same language of “one energy” as the *Pact of Union* had when speaking about the Incarnation.¹⁰⁴ Dionysius’s words would appear on the lips of other Monothelites and Monenergists as well. Pyrrhus wielded Dionysius’s “theandric energy” against Maximus in their dispute in 645,¹⁰⁵ and the acts of the third session of the Lateran Synod of 649 have Pope Martin ordering this single line read into the record; Cyrus mentioned it, Martin is supposed to have noted, in one of his chapters in order to prove what Martin termed Cyrus’s “innovation.”¹⁰⁶

Dionysius appeared at the Sixth Council too. In the second session, Macarius of Antioch argued that Leo I’s apparent affirmation of two energies in Christ should be interpreted not in a numeric sense but rather along the lines of Dionysius’s notion of a “theandric” energy.¹⁰⁷ In the eighth session, when Macarius confessed his faith before the council, he ended by quoting the same celebrated lines from Areopagite’s fourth letter;¹⁰⁸ Macarius also alluded to the lines in his subscription to a defiant written confession of faith read out at the council.¹⁰⁹ In the late seventh century, the Dyothelite Anastasius of Sinai complained that when he had spoken at great length about Christ’s wills and energies, his Monothelite opponent would repeatedly poke him in the side with his hand, “whispering and mentioning and bringing up the theandric energy of Dionysius.”¹¹⁰

The patristic support—Chalcedonian, Miaphysite, and Dionysian—that Monenergists were able to marshal to advance their position suggests that Sergius’s, Heraclius’s, and Cyrus’s decision to pursue church unity on the basis of these ideas was an astute one. These were doctrines that were supported by figures from each side and, importantly, by a figure

102 Translation Allen, *Sophronius of Jerusalem*, 171, 173, with my alterations. The passage comes from the seventh chapter of the *Pact of Union*. See ACO 2.2.2:598.20–22. καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ἕνα Χριστὸν καὶ υἱὸν ἐνεργοῦντα τὰ θεοπρεπῆ καὶ ἀνθρώπινα μιᾷ θεανδρικῇ ἐνεργείᾳ κατὰ τὸν ἐν ἁγίοις Διονύσιον. The most controversial section of the *Pact of Union* was this seventh chapter, which was also recorded in the acts of the Lateran Synod of 649. See ACO 2.1:134.9–31. For a discussion, French translation, and summary of the entire *Pact of Union*, based on the full version contained in the thirteenth act of the Sixth Council, see Hefele and Leclercq, *Histoire*, 340–41.

103 At least, that is, according to the later and hostile *Disputation with Pyrrhus*. See above, n. 40.

104 He omitted the Dionysian “theandric,” but otherwise quoted the *Pact of Union* nearly verbatim: ACO 2.1:136.36–37. καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ἕνα Χριστὸν ἐνεργεῖν τὰ θεοπρεπῆ καὶ ἀνθρώπινα μιᾷ ἐνεργείᾳ. See Grumel, *Regestes*, 1:219 (no. 290) and Winkelmann, *Der monenergetisch-monotheletische Streit*, 76, no. 40. An English translation of the entire letter can be found in Allen, *Sophronius of Jerusalem*, 177–83.

105 PG 91:345C. See the discussion in Bausenhardt, “*In allem uns gleich ausser der Sünde*” (n. 59 above), 304–9.

106 My translation. See ACO 2.1:140.29 and more generally 140.23–36. See also CPG 9400.

107 ACO 2.2.1:32.10–34.8. See esp. 34.1–4. Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ εὐσεβέστατος βασιλεὺς εἶπεν· Ἀλλὰ μίαν ἐνέργειαν νοεῖς αὐτὸν λέγοντα; Μακάριος ὁ ὁσιώτατος ἀρχιεπίσκοπος εἶπεν· Ἐγὼ ἀριθμὸν οὐ λέγω, ἀλλὰ θεανδρικὴν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐνέργειαν κατὰ τὸν ἅγιον Διονύσιον.

108 See ACO 2.2.1:216.24–28: ὁμολογοῦντες ἐν θέλημα ὑποστατικὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐνὸς κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεανδρικὴν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐνέργειαν. οὕτε γὰρ τὰ θεία κατὰ θεὸν οὕτε τὰ ἀνθρώπινα κατὰ ἄνθρωπον ἀλλ’ ἀνδρωθέντος τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου καινὴν τινα τὴν θεανδρικὴν ἐνέργειαν πεπολιτεῦσθαι ὁμολογοῦμεν κατὰ τὸν ἅγιον Διονύσιον.

109 See ACO 2.2.1:230.19–24: Μακάριος ἐλέω θεοῦ ἐπίσκοπος Θεουπόλεως ὑπαγορεύσας πᾶν τὸ προκείμενον τῆς ὀρθοδοξίας ὕψος κατὰ τὰς ἐκθέσεις τῶν ἁγίων καὶ οἰκουμενικῶν πέντε συνόδων καὶ τῶν ὀνομαστῶν τεθέντων παρ’ ἐμοῦ ἁγίων ἐκκρίτων πατέρων τῶν ἐκθεμένων κατὰ τὴν προανατεταγμένην δύναμιν ἐν θέλημα ἐπὶ τοῦ <ἐνὸς> κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ θεανδρικὴν αὐτοῦ πολιτευσάμενον ἡμῖν τὴν ἐνέργειαν καὶ ὡς ἀσεβές ἐστι τὸ λέγειν ἐπὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν δύο θελήματα. . . . (emphasis added). See also CPG 7625, and Winkelmann, *Der monenergetisch-monotheletische Streit*, 164 (no. 163).

110 My translation. *Capita adversus monotheletas* 8.1, in K.–H. Uthemann, ed., Anastasius of Sinai, *Sermones duo in constitutionem hominis secundum imaginem dei necnon opuscula adversus monotheletas* (CCSG 12; Turnhout, 1985): 125.1–4: Ταῦτα δέ μου διεξερχομένου καὶ λέγοντος ἐκ πολλῆς τῆς ὥρας, νύττει μου τῇ χειρὶ τὴν πλευρὰν συχνὰ ὁ δι’ ἐναντίας, τὴν θεανδρικὴν Διονυσίου ἐνέργειαν ψιθυρίζων καὶ ὑπομνήσκων καὶ προφέρων.

(Dionysius) held in high regard and claimed by both sides. Whatever political uses Monenergist doctrines might have been put to by Byzantine emperors in the seventh century, the ideas they represented were clearly already in the air and being discussed in the sixth.¹¹¹ Looking for church unity, Sergius, Heraclius, and Cyrus had perceptively identified doctrines that seemed to have good prospects for bringing differing sides together.

But, as an instrument of unity, Monenergism did not simply fail: it did so spectacularly. Despite a measure of theological and political successes for parts of

111 See Brock, "Monothelete Florilegium," 44. Also, cf. K.-H. Uthemann, "Der Neuchalkedonismus" (n. 9 above). In C. Moeller, "Le chalcédonisme et le néo-chalcédonisme en Orient de 451 à la fin du VI^e siècle," in *Das Konzil von Chalkedon: Geschichte und Gegenwart*, vol. 1, *Der Glaube von Chalkedon*, ed. A. Grillmeier and H. Bacht (Würzburg, 1951), 711–17, there is a helpful and clear discussion of the ideas of Christ's energy and will (and his sinlessness and knowledge) in the sixth century. More recently, for the sixth-century background, see Lange, *Mia energieia* (n. 4 above), 417–46. For Monenergist thought from the fourth century to early seventh centuries, see Hovorun, *Will, Action, and Freedom* (n. 3 above), 5–51. It is important to point out that, even though the individuals most strongly associated with Monenergism were Chalcedonians of the sixth century, Miaphysites had also made use of one-energy language in the century before the Monenergist controversy erupted (see above, n. 88). It was precisely the fact that both Miaphysites and Chalcedonians had both been using one energy language that presumably made the doctrine of the one-energy attractive to use in attempts at church reunion. I am not concerned in this article with how the doctrine of Christ's one will related to members of the Church of the East ("Nestorians"), but it is worth pointing out that Dyothelites attempted to connect Monotheletism with Nestorianism (see the testimonia from Nestorius and Theodore of Mopsuestia assembled in Diekamp, *Doctrina Patrum*, 304–6), and that the Church of the East saw Monotheletism as being in agreement with the teaching of Theodore of Mopsuestia (see A. Scher and P. Dib, ed. and trans., *Histoire nestorienne [Chronique de Séert]*, PO 5.2 [Paris, 1910], 528). There is a report that the East Syrian Patriarch Isho'yahb II of Gdala (sed. 628–645) met Heraclius in Aleppo around 630 on an embassy from the Sasanian Queen Boran. Unlike the Miaphysite patriarch who had refused to give Heraclius communion at roughly the same time and in roughly the same place (see above, nn. 23–25), Isho'yahb II celebrated a liturgy and allowed Heraclius to communicate. Isho'yahb also gave Heraclius a statement of faith, which the emperor accepted. "Isho'yahb's belief," the *Chronicle of Seert* noted, "was in agreement with the belief of Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople, in acknowledging one will and one energy." For the embassy, see *ibid.*, 557–60 (quotation at 560, my translation). Also see S. P. Brock, "Isho'yahb II of Gdala," in *Gorgias Encyclopedia of the Syriac Heritage*, ed. S. P. Brock, A. M. Butts, G. A. Kiraz, and L. van Rompay (Piscataway, NJ, 2011), 218.

the seventh century, in the long-term, Monenergism, along with Monotheletism, would be eventually condemned and anathematized, ending up as doctrinal orphans which no community in later Christian history would identify with. Dyothelites polemicized relentlessly against all claims to historic legitimacy made by Monenergists and Monotheletes. They had no other choice: to allow that the words of venerable teachers might provide authority and support for opposing central doctrines would be to admit a principle which those venerable teachers themselves had not held. To deny the unity of revealed truth would change the rules of the game.¹¹² Consequently, any Monenergist or Monothelete patristic proof text had to be undermined. In practice, this meant that each testimonium was branded in one of three ways: as a forgery, as having been taken out of context, or as having been misattributed, being in reality the work of a heretic. The effort to deny any connection with orthodox writers in the past was comprehensive: the only genealogy Dyothelites would permit Monenergists and Monotheletes was either heretical, recent, or, paradoxically, both.

When, for example, Pyrrhus cited the sixth-century address of Menas to Maximus in their Carthage debate, Maximus accused him of speaking falsehood.¹¹³ For the twelfth session of the Sixth Ecumenical Council, the address was "fabricated and false in everything."¹¹⁴ Pyrrhus's attempt to cite Pope Honorius's teaching of the doctrine of the one will was dismissed by Maximus as based on misunderstanding and an example of people in Constantinople interpreting Honorius's letter to Sergius in a way that

112 See Chadwick, "Florilegium" (n. 70 above), col. 1156, on the Irenaeian principle of the unity of revealed truth that underlay the development of dogmatic florilegia. P. Gray, "Forgery as an Instrument of Progress: Reconstructing the Theological Tradition in the Sixth Century," *BZ* 81 (1988): 288–89, describes the development of the view that there can be no change or innovation in the tradition of the church and the confidence in the univocity of that tradition.

113 *Disputatio cum Pyrrho*, PG 91:328B: θαυμάζω πῶς πατριάρχαι ὄντες κατατολᾶτε τοῦ ψεύδους. English translation in Farrell, *Disputation with Pyrrhus*, 48.

114 My translation. ACO 2.2.2:532.5–6. Also, cf. ACO 2.2.1:40.23–24. μὴ ἀναγνωσθῇ ὁ λεγόμενος λόγος Μηναῖ πρὸς Βιγίλιον, πλάστὸς γάρ ἐστιν. In the third session of the council, the address was allegedly found to be located in three unnumbered quaternions inserted at the beginning of the codex which contained the acts of the Fifth Council; these inserted, unnumbered quaternions were also in a different hand. See ACO 2.2.1:40.32–42.4.

suit them;¹¹⁵ when Pyrrhus pointed out that Cyril of Alexandria had explicitly spoken of Christ exhibiting one energy in both natures, Maximus argued at length that Cyril's words actually *supported* the idea of two energies.¹¹⁶ About a decade later, in the debate between Theodosius and Maximus, Maximus would parry Theodosius's appeal to this same passage with the charge that the line in question was actually inserted into Cyril's *Commentary on John* by Timothy Aelurus, the famous fifth-century Alexandrian Miaphysite.¹¹⁷ In the same debate, Maximus dismissed testimonia (χρήσεις) from Julius of Rome, Gregory the Wonderworker, and Athanasius as actually being Apollinarian forgeries.¹¹⁸ Two more Monenergist testimonia from Chrysostom were actually, Maximus alleged, written by Nestorius.¹¹⁹

The clearest example of the Dyothelite attack on Monenergist and Monothelete historical claims was the Council of Constantinople of 680–681; it was in many ways more of a philological than a theological event and much of its activity involved the delegitimation of any claim to the patristic past that Monotheletes might put forth.¹²⁰ The leading

Monothelete at the council was Macarius, the patriarch of Antioch, and his attempts to find justification for Monothelete doctrine in the words of previous orthodox Fathers were repeatedly rebuffed, challenged, and dismissed by the Synod. In its first session, the council rejected Macarius's claim that a line from Cyril, speaking of Christ's "all-powerful will," means that Christ has one will.¹²¹ The third session saw Menas's address to Vigilius and Pope Vigilius's words about a single energy in Christ—both present in Brock's Monothelete florilegium—challenged as interpolated and taken out of context.¹²² In the sixth session of the council, as soon as Macarius had produced his third codex of patristic testimonia supporting the doctrine of the one will, Roman legates disputed the contents of all three codices on the grounds that Macarius had either taken texts actually written about the will of the Trinity and applied them to the will of the Incarnate Christ or taken texts which were in fact written about Christ but cut away words and ideas which gave them a proper (non-Monothelete) context.¹²³

In the eighth and ninth sessions of the council, the challenge to Macarius and the Monotheletes turned into a public spectacle. When confronted with having taken patristic quotes out of context, Macarius's explanation—that he had excerpted the testimonia with the aim of supporting his position¹²⁴—did not go over well with those present. Insults, anathemas, and imprecations poured down on him: he was called a heretic, a new Dioscorus, and a new Apollinaris. Stripped down, he was made to stand in the middle of the synod with two associates, Stephen and Theophanes, and questioned directly about his beliefs.¹²⁵ Throughout the eighth and into the ninth session of the council, Macarius's testimonia were found again and again to be misleadingly excerpted. At last, in the ninth session, an enraged synod poured down more insults on the

115 *Disputatio cum Pyrrho*, PG 91:328D–329A. . . οἱ ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει τὰ ἀπὸ καρδίας λαλοῦντες. English translation in Farrell, *Disputation with Pyrrhus*, 49–50. Earlier, Maximus had claimed that the notion of "one will" in Honorius's letter was "invented" (ἀνεπλάσθη) by those who translated the work from Latin into Greek. See *Opuscula theologica et polemica (Tomus dogmaticus ad Marinum presbyterum)* (CPG 7697.7), PG 91:244D. P. Sherwood, *An Annotated Date-List of the Works of Maximus the Confessor*, Studia Anselmiana 30 (Rome, 1952), 41–42, suggests this text was written by 640.

116 Οὐ μάχεται ὅλως ἡ παρούσα χρήσις ταῖς δύο ἐνεργείας-τουαντίον δὲ, καὶ συνίστησιν. See PG 91:344B–345C, English translation in Farrell, *Disputation with Pyrrhus*, 64–65. The passage from Cyril, *μίαν συγγενή δι' ἀμφοῖν ἐπιδεδειγμένον ἐνέργειαν*, comes from his *Commentary on John*, 4.2: see Bausenhardt, "In allem uns gleich ausser der Sünde," 292–99 (no. 83).

117 *Disputatio Bizae*, 101.299–301 in Allen and Neil, *Scripta saeculi VII*. Note also the Greek scholion in *ibid.*, 101, which also states the testimonium in question was interpolated by Timothy Aelurus.

118 *Disputatio Bizae*, 99.276–84, Allen and Neil, *Scripta saeculi VII*.

119 *Ibid.*, 99.285–88, Allen and Neil, *Scripta saeculi VII*. Maximus supposedly shows Theodosius the passages in the works of Nestorius, 101.292–93.

120 See the observations of A. Alexakis, *Codex Parisinus Graecus 1115 and Its Archetype* (Washington, DC, 2006), 31. For a summary of the Council's events, see Riedinger's overview, in ACO 2.2.2., 10–15.

Descriptions are also available in F.-X. Murphy and P. Sherwood, *Constantinople II et Constantinople III* (Paris, 1973), 189–219, and Alexakis, *Codex Parisinus*, 22–31.

121 ACO 2.2.1:24.7–28.

122 For Menas, see ACO 2.2.1:40.32–42.4 and above, n. 114. For Vigilius, see ACO 2.2.1:42.12–44.18.

123 See ACO 2.2.1:178.10–18.

124 ACO 2.2.1:238.4: Ἐγὼ τὰς χρήσεις, ἃς παρεξέβαλον, κατὰ τὸν ἴδιον σκοπὸν παρεξέβαλον and ACO 2.2.1:242.8: Καὶ ἤδη εἶπον, ὅτι θέλων συστήσασθαι τὸν σκοπὸν μου οὕτως παρεξέβαλον.

125 ACO 2.2.1:242.10–18.

the florilegium, noted that it represented the largest collection of Dyothelite testimonia to have survived from the seventh century.¹³⁵ So far as the Irenaeian extracts from this florilegium were concerned, however, they could not have been the actual work of Irenaeus. Importantly, this instance of falsification was not, Richard noted, unique. At least five more texts in the *Florilegium Achridense* (attributed to Hippolytus, Cyril of Alexandria, Basil of Caesarea, and Eustathius of Antioch) were not authentic. The texts in question, Richard suggested, were not invented to increase the size of the florilegium, but were rather most likely excerpted from a variety of pseudepigraphal works that were in circulation in the seventh century as part of the Monenergist-Monothelite controversy.¹³⁶ In other words, Dyothelites were using precisely the sorts of dubious texts and questionable tactics they had attacked Monothelites for using.¹³⁷ And, in this regard, the *Florilegium Achridense* was itself not an isolated case. John Madden has argued that various definitions of *thelesis* attributed by Maximus to earlier writers of high standing—Clement of Alexandria, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Eustathius of Antioch, Alexander of Alexandria, Athanasius, Gregory Nyssen, and Nemesius of Emesa—were all in fact “fabricated,” either by Maximus himself or by one of his followers.¹³⁸ Similarly, the pro-Dyothelite acts of the Lateran Synod of 649 seem to record a conciliar event that took place in Rome, in Latin; but they were actually written

originally in Greek and then translated into Latin.¹³⁹ In other words, the acta, as Riedinger pointed out, seem to come from a council that was never actually held.¹⁴⁰ Riedinger, who edited the Greek and Latin texts of the acta, suggested that Maximus and his followers authored the acta and that the document represented a vehicle for Maximus to express his theological views in a way that gave them the imprimatur of not just the Pope, but also a number of bishops.¹⁴¹ Maximus would later refer to the Lateran Synod as the Sixth Ecumenical Council.¹⁴² Monothelites were accused of many sorts of textual skulduggery, but they were never charged with having written up the acts of a council before it happened, in a language it could not have happened in, and then later portraying the council as ecumenical.¹⁴³

While Dyothelites might be credited with over-emphasizing the importance of some ecclesiastical gatherings, they might at the same time be seen as downplaying that of others. At some point around 636, a synod was held on Cyprus for the purpose of discussing the ideas of Maximus. It had many of the trappings of an ecumenical gathering: forty-six participants were there, including Cyrus of Alexandria, Sophronius of Jerusalem, and representatives from Rome and Constantinople. Yet our only evidence of the synod’s occurrence comes from a single text of Monothelite provenance, apparently written by an actual attendee of the gathering.¹⁴⁴ And similarly, the pro-Monothelite

135 M. Richard, “Une faux dithélite—le traité de S. Irénée au diacre Démétrius,” in *Polychronion: Festschrift Franz Dölger zum 75. Geburtstag*, ed. P. Wirth (Heidelberg, 1966), 433. Cf. R. Riedinger, “Die Lateransynode von 649 und Maximus der Bekenner,” in *Maximus Confessor: Actes du Symposium pour Maxime le Confesseur*, ed. F. Heinzer and C. Schönborn (Fribourg, 1980), 120. See also Winkelmann, *Der monenergetisch-monotheletische Streit*, 176, no. 174.

136 Richard, “Une faux dithélite,” 438–39.

137 Gray makes the same observation with respect to Miaphysites and Chalcedonians in the sixth century. Speaking, e.g., about the sixth-century dyophysite florilegium of Leontius of Jerusalem (based on unpublished research of Richard), he writes: “Of the one hundred and fourteen texts in his dyophysite florilegium, twenty-six are forgeries in the strict sense or else misattributions, and a further ten are suspect. All five texts attributed to Justin Martyr, and eight of the eleven attributed to John Chrysostom are forgeries!” Gray, “Forgery” (n. 112 above), 284–85.

138 See J. D. Madden, “The Authenticity of Early Definitions of Will (*Thelesis*),” in Heinzer and Schönborn, *Maximus Confessor*, 61–79; see 78 for Madden’s remarks on the falsification of these citations.

139 See Riedinger, “Die Lateransynode von 649,” 113.

140 Ibid., 118.

141 Ibid., 119. Riedinger (120) suggests that the Latin translation of the Synod’s acts were read out before the Pope and his bishops, but we cannot know for sure what actually took place in the Lateran Palace in October 649. Alexakis, *Codex parisinus graecus*, 18–19 provides a useful discussion of the question of the composition of the acta of the Lateran Synod.

142 Riedinger, “Die Lateransynode von 649,” 119, citing PG 91:137D.

143 For an attempt to moderate Riedinger’s suggestions and place the composition of the acts of the Lateran Synod in a broader conciliar context, see C. Cubitt, “The Lateran Council of 649 as an Ecumenical Council,” in *Chalcedon in Context: Church Councils 400–700*, ed. R. Price and M. Whitby (Liverpool, 2009), 133–47. R. Price, “Aspects of the Composition of the Acts of the Lateran Synod of 649,” *AnnHistCon* 42 (2010): 51–58, also represents an attempt to nuance and contextualize the force of Riedinger’s philological discoveries and arguments.

144 See S. P. Brock, “An Early Syriac Life of Maximus the Confessor,” *AB* 91 (1973): 315–17 and Brock’s comment on 342.

synod of 662 in Constantinople, which anathematized Maximus and at which the patriarchs of Constantinople and Antioch were present, along with the *topoteretes* of Alexandria, has left scarcely any historical imprint.¹⁴⁵

Where does this all leave us? Judging by what little of their work remains, Monenergists and, later, Monotheletes viewed themselves as legitimate Chalcedonians, standing in line with respected and venerable figures of the orthodox past. They were careful to construct florilegia to prove precisely this point. They viewed their Dyothelete opponents as using ideas and concepts which were innovations and foreign to orthodox patristic usage and characteristic of notorious heretics.¹⁴⁶ Their opponents fabricated texts to be used against them and, in their polemics, their opponents made use of pseudepigraphal works. Monotheletes also attempted to seek out and destroy the written work of their opponents. What is more, Monotheletes used violence against their opponents. In short, Monotheletes actually look quite a bit like Dyotheletes.¹⁴⁷

People

I now want to return to Syria and suggest that Monotheletes resembled Dyotheletes in one more respect: they actually existed. Monenergism and Monotheletism, I want to argue, were more than failed ideas floating around in the ether at the twilight of antiquity. They were more than a political compromise worked out by a patriarch, an emperor, or a bishop of Alexandria. To the extent that any of these doctrines was experienced and believed, Monenergism and Monotheletism were at least as much an example of concrete and lived doctrines as Dyenergism and

Dyotheletism were. “I will not say two physical wills or two physical energies in the incarnate dispensation of our Lord Jesus Christ,” Macarius of Antioch had told the Sixth Council, “even if I were chopped up, piece by piece, and thrown into the sea.”¹⁴⁸ Here is hardly a statement of someone adhering to a doctrine he believed was a political compromise.

This brings us back to Syria and to the testimony of Michael the Great. There are tantalizing bits of evidence that suggest that Michael was in fact not too far from the truth when he asserted that the Chalcedonians of Greater Syria had been Monothelete until the 720s. To Michael’s account might also be added that of Thomas of Kafartāb, an eleventh-century Monothelete writer. For Thomas, Dyotheletism was an innovation of Maximus’s that was introduced to Syria by imperial fiat and threat of violence but resisted by the people of Mount Lebanon, Ḥimṣ, Ḥamāh, and Aleppo; these populations chose to be loyal to the councils of the church and sided with the monks of the Monastery of Maron.¹⁴⁹ Distracted by the Islamic conquests, emperors ceased trying to change the beliefs of Syria’s Monotheletes, but Maximus’s disciples continued their work unabated. Like Michael, Thomas saw the shift to Dyotheletism among Syrians as an event connected to elite attitudes: it was the followers of Maximus, Thomas alleged, who induced Syrian notables to their doctrine through bribes and gifts. “But we Syrians,” Thomas continued, “have stayed firm in the truth set out by the Five Councils.”¹⁵⁰ Thomas’s account is, of course, tendentious, but no less so than accounts of the controversy written by Dyotheletes.¹⁵¹ No party in the dispute was aiming for dispassionate objectivity when speaking about its events.

One of the most consequential differences between Dyothelete and Monothelete accounts of the controversy, however, is that most modern retellings of the dispute usually adopt, consciously or unconsciously, some

145 Winkelmann, *Der monenergetisch-monotheletische Streit*, 151 (no. 148a); cf. ACO 2.2.1:228.15–230.9.

146 One of the words that Brock was able to make out in the underwriting of Dayr al-Suryān fragment 88, a document that contains objections to the Sixth Council, written by an apparent participant, is *ܐܝܢܐ* or “innovation.” See Brock and van Rompay, *Catalogue* (n. 69 above), 426.

147 It is a testimony to the lasting effectiveness of Dyothelete attempts to delegitimize Monotheletes that a view of Monotheletism as a failed political compromise is typical of most scholarship. Hovorun’s description of Monotheletism as an artificial and elite doctrine “imposed on the broader masses” (*Will, Action and Freedom* [n. 3 above], 93) might, with equal legitimacy, be used to characterize Dyotheletism and Dyenergism.

148 My translation. ACO 2.2.1:232.11–13. Maximus, of course, suffered real amputation because of his beliefs.

149 Chartouni, *Traité* (n. 41 above), 26–27 (Arabic; 92–93 French trans.).

150 My translation. *Ibid.*, 28 (94–95 trans.).

151 See, e.g., Anastasius of Sinai’s account of the controversy in *Homilia iii de creatione hominis* 1, in K.-H. Uthemann, ed., *Sermones Duo in Constitutionem Hominis secundum Imaginem Dei necnon Opuscula Adversus Monotheletas*, CCSG 12 (Turnhout, 1985), 56–61.

version of the Dyothelite understanding of the affair.¹⁵² But once we have realized that each side in the conflict portrayed the other as a heretical mutation and that both sides in the conflict had been able to show that the previous tradition had used the same language they were now employing, the charges of newness and innovation lose their force. Both Monothelites and Dyothelites were able to cite pre-seventh-century authors to give their views an ancient and respected pedigree, but both were in a very profound sense equally seventh-century phenomena, as Marek Jankowiak has argued.¹⁵³

Michael's and Thomas's accounts of the controversy have to their credit the simple fact that there seems to be a correlation between Monothelite sympathies in the later seventh century and place of origin: many prominent Monothelites seem to have had a connection to Syria. In the acta of the Sixth Council, Monothelite belief is often found being expressed by Syrians. Constantine, for example, a priest from Apamea, was one of the most intriguing figures to appear in the acts of the Sixth Council. When he first showed up in the sixteenth session, Constantine appeared as an irenic, even endearing figure, one who preferred to write his statement of belief in Syriac and have it translated into Greek and read out rather than speaking about his belief in Greek himself.¹⁵⁴ "From the beginning, I have wanted to come to the Synod," he tells the council, "and pray that there might be peace, that in some way a *henoticon* might take place in its midst, and that neither this side nor that might suffer, that is, those who say one will and those who say two."¹⁵⁵ Somewhat predictably, perhaps, Constantine was eventually anathematized as a Monothelite.¹⁵⁶ Constantine, however, was not the only Monenergist or Monothelite with Syrian connections. No less than Sergius of Constantinople was a Syrian whose parents were allegedly Miaphysites; Sergius's Syrian origin was

seen as an explanation for his Monenergist views.¹⁵⁷ The main pro-Monothelite voices at the Sixth Council belonged to Macarius, the patriarch of Antioch, and his followers. Macarius's predecessor as patriarch of Antioch, Macedonius, was also a Monothelite.¹⁵⁸

It may, however, be suggested that it should come as no surprise that patriarchs of Antioch, especially ones who assumed their offices while Monothelite emperors reigned, were Monothelites as well.¹⁵⁹ Furthermore, these patriarchs spent their time in Constantinople rather than in Antioch: Eutychius states that Macedonius never entered Antioch,¹⁶⁰ and we know from a letter written by Constantine IV to Pope Donus that Macarius was living in Constantinople in the late 670s, something which led Winkelmann to suggest he was living there on a permanent basis.¹⁶¹ Even if the

157 See Anastasius of Sinai, *Homilia iii de creatione hominis* 1.44–48 in Uthemann, ed., *Sermones Duo in Constitutionem Hominis secundum Imaginem Dei*, 57: 'Ο δὲ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως Σέργιος, ἄτε δὴ ἄτε συρογενὴς ὑπάρχων, ὡς δὲ λόγος, καὶ γονέων Ἰακωβιτῶν ἔκγονος, τὰ ἐναντία Μαρτίνου ἐπέστειλε πρὸς Ἡράκλειον, μίαν τε φυσικὴν θέλησιν καὶ ἐνέργειαν ἐν Χριστῷ ὁμολογήσας. The Dyothelite tendency to try to portray Monothelitism as having its true roots in heresy makes the charge that Sergius's parents were "Jacobites" seem like one more attempt to denigrate the Monothelite position. Only a few lines previously (1.21–23), Anastasius describes Athanasius I Gamolo, the Miaphysite Patriarch of Antioch, as clever with words and devious, as is natural for Syrians (!). The Greek vita of Maximus also portrays Athanasius I as cunning and credits him with shifting Heraclius towards Monenergism. See B. Neil and P. Allen, eds. and trans., *The Life of Maximus the Confessor: Recension 3* (Strathfield, New South Wales, 2003), 52 (Greek; 53 Eng. trans.).

158 Winkelmann, *Der monenergetisch-monothelische Streit*, 235. (Cf. ACO 2.2.1:230.5–6.)

159 We know that Macarius became patriarch before November or December 669, but nothing more than that; see Brandes, "Melkitischen Patriarchen" (n. 127 above), 51. It seems reasonable that he became patriarch while the Monothelite Constans II was still emperor.

160 This is mentioned in the longer, Antiochian, recension of Eutychius of Alexandria. See L. Cheikho, B. Carra de Vaux, and H. Zayyat, eds., *Eutychii Patriarchae Alexandrini Annales*, CSCO 51, Scriptores Arabici 7 (Beirut and Paris, 1909), 13; Latin translation in PG 111:1096a and English translation in A. Stewart, *The History of Jerusalem A.D. 1180*, Palestine Pilgrims' Text Society 11 (London, 1895), 60. Eutychius also refers to Macedonius as a Maronite. On the Antiochian and Alexandrian recensions of Eutychius, see n. 225, below.

161 Winkelmann, *Der monenergetisch-monothelische Streit*, 231, though Frank Trombley suggests that Byzantine-Arab relations in the late 670s and early 680s would have made it possible for Macarius to travel to Syria and Mesopotamia for church matters. See

152 See the comments of Price, "Monothelitism" (n. 94 above), 232.

153 For the actual novelty of both of these views as fully formed, self-conscious doctrines, see Jankowiak, "The Invention of Dyothelitism" (n. 7 above).

154 See ACO 2.2.2:696.6–7: καὶ ἄρτι, ἐὰν κελεύητε, ἵνα, ὃ δέδωκέ μοι ὁ θεὸς περὶ πίστεως, γράψω Συριστὶ καὶ ἐρμηνεύεται Γραικιστὶ.

155 My translation. ACO 2.2.2:696.1–3. This statement was apparently made in Greek.

156 ACO 2.2.2:700.12–20.

Abbot Stephen, humiliated along with Macarius at the Sixth Council and anathematized, actually hailed from Antioch, this does not perhaps prove as much as we might like.

These pieces of evidence are all suggestive of a correlation between Syria and Monenergism-Monothelism, but we should also turn elsewhere to see if we cannot find anything that may help evaluate Michael's assertion that all the Chalcedonians of Syria and Palestine had "not accepted at all" the "heresy" of Maximus. Constantine the Monothelite was a Syriac speaker and it is in Syriac that we have preserved two sets of Monothelite aporetic questions whose goal it was to confound and defeat Dyothelites in debate. Among surviving Monothelite material, these documents are unique—nothing like them exists in Greek—and Brock suggested that they were originally composed in Syriac.¹⁶² And this is not the only originally Syriac Monothelite material that we have—the Syriac *Life* of Maximus the Confessor, also published by Brock,¹⁶³ is another important Monothelite text, as are the newly discovered Syriac fragments from Dayr al-Suryān, containing an account of the Sixth Council,¹⁶⁴ and another Syriac account, also published by Brock, of the Sixth Council.¹⁶⁵

The recognition by a variety of medieval writers of the connection between Monothelism and the Maronites is important. Without entering into the debate over their "perpetual orthodoxy,"¹⁶⁶ I will

accept Michael the Great's equation of Maronites and Monothelites and assume that Maronites were in fact Monothelites.¹⁶⁷ Once this is done, a number of interesting references begin to appear in the context of Syria.

For example, an anonymous historical text which has been dated to about 664 and is known as the *Maronite Chronicle* records a dispute ca. 659 between the Miaphysite patriarch Theodore, the famous Miaphysite scholar-bishop Severus Sebokht, and the Maronites held before the Caliph Mu'awiya in Damascus in which the Maronites were victorious.¹⁶⁸ Gribomont observed that the context of the debate suggests that it was most likely about the possession of churches, and furthermore that the Maronites seemed to be speaking in the name of all the Chalcedonians in Damascus.¹⁶⁹ If this is true, it would follow that

idem, "A Note on the See of Jerusalem and the Synodal List of the Sixth Ecumenical Council," *Byzantion* 53 (1983): 637.

162 See S. P. Brock, "Two Sets of Monothelite Questions to the Maximianists," *OLP* 17 (1986): 119–40. I am grateful to an anonymous reader for this point and for the suggestion that nothing similar can be found in Greek. It is worth noting, however, that since the *Hodegos* of Anastasius of Sinai contains aporetic material in Greek to be used against Monenergists, one might assume that such materials, composed by Monenergists-Monothelites, existed in Greek as well (see, for example, note 239, below). For Monothelite aporetic material which survives in Arabic (though translated from Syriac), see n. 162, below, on the *Kitāb al-hudā*.

163 Brock, "Early Syriac Life" (n. 144 above), 299–346.

164 Dayr al-Suryān Fragment 88.

165 See Brock, "Syriac Fragment" (n. 85 above).

166 See 1–14 of M. Breydy's introduction to his French translation, *Jean Maron: Exposé de la foi et autres opuscules*, CSCO 498, Scriptorum Syri 210 (Louvain, 1988), critical of attempts to connect Maronites with Monothelism. For an opposing view, see the excellent article by S. Vailhé, "Origines religieuses des Maronites," *EO*

4 (1901): 96–102, 154–62, and the fascinating follow-up, which deals with the reaction this piece provoked from the Maronite Archbishop of Beirut, idem, "Origines religieuses des Maronites," *EO* 5 (1902): 281–89. Also containing useful information is E. Ajam, "Le monothélisme des Maronites d'après les auteurs Melchites," *EO* 9 (1906): 91–95. For a general overview of the question and all the various scholars who have taken part in this debate down through the centuries, see H. Suermann, *Die Gründungsgeschichte der Maronitischen Kirche*, Orientalia Biblica et Christiana 10 (Wiesbaden, 1998), 3–39.

167 See, e.g., the anonymous *Chronicle to 846*'s reference to the "heresy of the Maronites" in connection with the reigns of Justinian II, Constantine IV, and Philippicus Bardanes in E. W. Brooks, ed., *Chronica Minora, pars secunda*, CSCO 3, Scriptorum Syri 4 (Paris and Leipzig, 1904), 231. English translation available in idem, "A Syriac Chronicle of the Year 846," *ZDMG* 51 (1897): 580. At n. 2 Brooks suggests that this Miaphysite chronicle's speaking about the Maronites as heretical might indicate an underlying Melkite source. For the *Chronicle of 846* sharing a source, at least for some sixth-century events, with the seventh-century *Melkite Chronicle*, see A. de Halleux, "La chronique melkite abrégée du ms Sināi syr. 10," *Le Muséon* 91 (1978): 1–13 and idem, "À la source d'une biographie expurgée de Philoxène de Mabbog," *Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica* 6–7 (1975–76): 253–66 and idem, "Une notice syro-chalcédonienne sur Sévère d'Antioche," *Parole de l'Orient* 6–7 (1975–76): 461–77.

168 See Brooks, *Chronica Minora*, 70. For an English translation of this episode, see A. Palmer, *The Seventh Century in the West-Syrian Chronicles* (Liverpool, 1993), 30. Dayr al-Suryān fragment 5 contains new material from the *Maronite Chronicle*, though nothing relating to the Monenergist-Monothelite controversy. See Brock and van Rompay, *Catalogue* (n. 69 above), 373–75.

169 Gribomont, "Documents" (n. 11 above), 119. Though it should be pointed out that the *Maronite Chronicle* explicitly states that the debate was *ܠܚܝܬܐ ܕܐܝܬܐ* "concerning faith" (Brooks, *Chronica Minora*, 70). In keeping with Gribomont's suggestion, however, it is worth recalling the passage in Michael the Great,

the Maronites, that is, Monotheletes, were the most important Chalcedonian group in Damascus in the earliest Umayyad period.

BL Oriental 8606 represents another piece of intriguing evidence for the presence of Monotheletes in Greater Syria, though it is not unambiguous. This is a Chalcedonian Syriac manuscript, one that Brock showed long ago had found its way to London from St. Catherine's monastery in the Sinai.¹⁷⁰ Its contents are mostly works written by Athanasius, but it contains some other interesting items as well. Perhaps the most important thing about this manuscript for us at present is its colophon, which was written in Edessa in 723 and which serves as a precious witness to Chalcedonian history in Syria in that period.¹⁷¹ The colophon mentions that the cathedral of Edessa¹⁷² had both Greek- and Syriac-language choirs. The colophon also mentions that John, the bishop of Edessa, was the son of Simon, son of Gisra, "who is from Brişaye, a village in the district of the city of Hims." Furthermore, the manuscript "was arranged and collated with all accuracy by the unworthy Constantine, deacon and disciple of George . . . head bishop of Apamea, the city of Syria."¹⁷³ We know from other sources that it was precisely this part of Syria that was the home of the monastery of St. Maron;¹⁷⁴ this means that both Constantine and George hailed from a region that had

cited above (n. 25), where Chalcedonians seized Miaphysite churches. Michael also reports that when a city submitted to the Arabs, the new rulers gave the churches to whoever possessed them at the time. It was a big loss for the Miaphysites, he states, but they were freed from the cruelty of the Romans (4:410 [2:412–13 French trans.]).

170 See S. P. Brock, "The Provenance of BM Or. 8606," *JThS* 19 (1968): 632–33. Part of BL Or. 8606 is in Syriac Fragment 46 in Milan: see J.-B. Chabot, "Inventaire des fragments de mss. syriaques conservés à la Bibliothèque Ambrosienne à Milan," *Le Muséon* 49 (1936): 47 and C. Moss, "Note on the Patristic MS. Milan No 46," *Le Muséon* 49 (1936): 289–91.

171 See R. W. Thomson's remarks in idem, "An Eighth-Century Melkite Colophon from Edessa," *JThS* n.s. 13 (1962): 252.

172 Ibid., 253: "the House of the Image of the Lord" (trans. Thomson), which Thomson takes to refer to the Cathedral of Edessa. The Cathedral was in Chalcedonian possession from 629 and into at least the twelfth century; *ibid.*, 256–57.

173 Trans. Thomson in *ibid.*, 254.

174 See, e.g., P. Daou, "Le site du couvent principal de S. Maron en Syrie," *Parole de l'Orient* 3 (1972): 145–52 and Gribomont, "Documents," 123–24. Suermann, *Die Gründungsgeschichte der Maronitischen Kirche* (n. 166 above), 52–72, provides a summary of

strong Maronite associations.¹⁷⁵ But what is fascinating about the manuscript is that it also contains two items translated by Constantine in 721—a letter from Pope Felix to Peter and a letter from Sophronius to Arcadius of Cyprus—that oppose the addition of "who was crucified for us" to the Trisagion. In other words, even though the two men associated with the manuscript came from a Maronite region, the contents of the manuscript seem to be explicitly opposed to Maronite liturgical practice.¹⁷⁶

The story, however, is more complex. Also contained in the manuscript is a homily by Severian of Gabala, a contemporary of Chrysostom, entitled "On the Nativity of Our Lord," published by Cyril Moss in 1948.¹⁷⁷ The end of this homily contains the following theological statement:

For, just as when we say: Father and Son and Spirit, we proclaim three Persons and we assert one Substance, in the same way when we say: Divinity and Humanity, we proclaim two natures and we confess one Person—one Son, one God, and one authority and one power and *one energy*, one worship.¹⁷⁸

What we have here is a text with a Monenergist affirmation, though Moss did not recognize it. Moss was unable to find this text anywhere in Severian's works, but argued nonetheless that it was genuine Severian.¹⁷⁹ He did not realize, however, that precisely this passage is cited in a catena in the *Libellus fidei* of none other than John Maron, the putative first Maronite Patriarch of Antioch in the seventh century. Nau published a French translation of Maron's *Libellus fidei* in 1899 in which he translated the same passage from Severian as follows:

all the textual and archaeological evidence for the location of the monastery of St. Maron. Its precise location is still unknown.

175 Gribomont, "Documents" (n. 11 above), 107.

176 Ibid., 108.

177 C. Moss, "Homily on the Nativity of our Lord by Severian, Bishop of Gabala," *BSOAS* 12 (1948): 555–66.

178 Trans. Moss in *ibid.*, 566. Emphasis added.

179 Ibid., 556–58. Only a Syriac version is known to exist: see CPG 4260.

Him as Lord and Creator of all, do thou
supplicate on behalf of thy servants:
Reconciliation and pardon from thee we ask,
and thee will we in all faith call blessed.¹⁹⁵

Again, we have a clearly Monothelete text incongruously lying in the middle of a Dyothelete one; Matthew Black, who edited the *Horologion*, pointed out that though this same hymn to the Virgin exists in the Greek *Parakletike*, the key Monothelete clause is missing.¹⁹⁶ Here is another indication that a community—this time in Palestine, not in Edessa—that was once Monothelete, or which contained Monothelete elements, or which did not see Monotheletism as objectionable, eventually moved in the direction of Dyotheletism.

Michel Rajji brought one more such text to scholars' attention in 1951. This appears in a Melkite canonical collection that survives in six different Arabic manuscripts all written in twelfth- or thirteenth-century greater Syria; Rajji suggested that the original author of the collection was active not long after the Sixth Council.¹⁹⁷ Fascinating for us presently is a confession of faith recorded in the collection and meant to be recited on Holy Thursday, at the consecration of the Myron. Here, Christ is said to be "from two natures and in two natures";¹⁹⁸ Rajji thought this was a nod to Miaphysites, but this is not necessarily the case.¹⁹⁹

195 Trans. Black, *ibid.*, 124 (emphasis added). See also 11. The CPA text can be found on 409.

196 See *ibid.*, 11, where the Greek text is produced alongside an English translation of the CPA text.

197 M. Rajji, "Le monothélisme chez les Maronites et les Melkites," *JEH* 2 (1951): 39–40.

198 My translation from Beirut Bibliothèque Orientale (USJ) 514, fol. 398b and Beirut Bibliothèque Orientale (USJ) 515, p. 381 (fol. 189a). See Rajji, "Le monothélisme chez les Maronites et les Melkites," 40. Unfortunately, Rajji had typographical issues that made it impossible for him to print the Arabic text of the confession; instead, he printed only a Latin translation of it. I am grateful to the Hill Museum and Manuscript Library for making images of these two manuscripts available to me. I have not had the opportunity to see the other four manuscripts discussed by Rajji: Paris BNF Arabic 234, 235, 236, and Charfeh Arabic 4/1.

199 It could actually be a reference to the *Pact of Union* of 633 or the *Ekthesis*, both of which also affirm that Christ is both out of two natures and in two natures. For these passages, see articles six and seven of the *Pact of Union* in ACO 2.2.2:598. For the *Ekthesis*,

The confession becomes explicitly Monothelete at one point, affirming of Christ that "he has miracles and sufferings. Possessed of two natures, he is unique, having a will, an operation, [and is] a single person."²⁰⁰ The confession continues in a rather different note:

For he is so and confessing him in this way,
I accept and agree with and hold to. . . the
six holy and world-famous synods, all of
them [describes the councils of Nicaea,
Constantinople I, Ephesus, Chalcedon, Con-
stantinople II] . . . and also, those who gathered
in the city of Constantinople. They were 287
holy ones, Fathers celebrated for their knowl-
edge, the Sixth Synod. They defined Christ by
natures—two natures and two wills that are in
agreement, possessing their own activity and
will and ability. . . .²⁰¹

Paradoxically, the confession accepts the Sixth Council and also affirms two wills in Christ after affirming one will and one energy. Once again, it seems that

see ACO 2.1:158.29, 31–32: Ὁθεν καὶ ἐκ δύο φύσεων ἓνα Χριστὸν ὁμολογοῦμεν . . . καὶ ἐν δύο φύσει τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι δοξάζοντες . . . It should also be pointed out that these affirmations are commonly found in Neo-Chalcedonian authors.

200 My translation. See Beirut Bibliothèque Orientale (USJ) 514, fol. 398b: *lahu al-'ajā'ib wa-lahu al-maṣā'ib dhū ṭabī'atayn huwa al-wahid dhū irāda fi'l muwabbad al-uqnūm*. Unfortunately, the image of this manuscript available to me is blurry along the right margin of fol. 398b and it is possible that *dhū irāda* should be read *wa-dhū irāda*, in which case the sentence should read "and he has a will, an operation. . . ." Rajji, "Monothélisme," 40, translates this as *ille est unicus, et habet unam voluntatem et unam actionem cujus persona una facta est*. Rajji noted that two of the six manuscripts which contain this confession (Paris BNF Arabic 235 and Bibliothèque Orientale [USJ] 515) have changed the passage that reads "having a will and an energy" to read "willing and acting," in an attempt to smooth out the difficulties presented by the text as it stands. See, e.g., Beirut Bibliothèque Orientale (USJ) 515, fol. 381a: *wa-huwa al-wahid al-murid al-fā'il muwabbad al-uqnūm* (emphasis added), "and he is unique, who wills and acts and is a single person."

201 My translation based on Beirut Bibliothèque Orientale (USJ) 514, fol. 398b–399a and Beirut Bibliothèque Orientale (USJ) 515, pp. 381–382 (fols. 189a–b). Rajji, "Monothélisme," 40, gives the following Latin translation: *Cum iste (Christus, vel istud) est ita et cum sic confitendus (vel confitendum) est, accipio tamen . . . sex memoratissimas in mundo synodos, . . . etiam . . . sextam synodum cujus (Patres) definierunt Christum quoad naturas, in duas naturas et duas voluntates concordantes, habentes proprie actionem voluntatemque et potestatem. . . .*

we have a text that reflects the diverse theological heritage of the Chalcedonian community in Greater Syria. The existence of this confession of faith, the Christian Palestinian *Horologion*, Vatican Syriac 369, and Oriental 8606 can be accounted for only if we assume that at one point the Dyothelite communities which preserved them were in fact Monothelete, contained Monothelete elements, or had not consciously confronted the question of the number of wills in the incarnate Christ and, therefore, were imprecise and unsystematic in their language. Gribomont collected a list of other confessions that show traces of Monotheletism.²⁰² An obvious explanation for such survivals is that the Chalcedonians of Greater Syria did not fully expunge traces of their Monothelete past as they copied manuscripts.

We can perhaps also find evidence of this shift from Monotheletism to Dyothelitism in the writings of John of Damascus, who lived in Syria and Palestine from the late seventh through to the first half of the eighth centuries, precisely when Michael the Great states the shift was taking place.²⁰³ Michael the Great, as we have seen, credited John's father, Sergius b. Manṣūr, with not only persecuting and converting Miaphysites to Chalcedonianism but also with helping move people to the Dyothelite interpretation of Chalcedon.²⁰⁴ John himself wrote a work on the two wills of Christ,²⁰⁵ and there are hints in several of his other works that he did in fact live at a time when there were conflicts between Dyothelites and Monotheletes in Greater Syria. His *De recta sententia*, for example, was a *libellus* written for a bishop named Elia to give to Peter, the metropolitan of Damascus.²⁰⁶ The *De recta sententia* reflects an environment where Monotheletism was a clear and present danger, and Elia himself has been understood to

be a Maronite who was converting to Dyothelitism.²⁰⁷ Gribomont has pointed out a number of features of the *De recta sententia* which suggest that it was written in a milieu where Monotheletism was a live option: nearly a third of the text is taken up with a confession of belief in two wills and energies in Christ;²⁰⁸ Peter the Fuller's version of the Trisagion is rejected;²⁰⁹ and the six ecumenical councils are accepted, along with their anathemas—Sergius, Cyrus of Alexandria, Patriarchs Paul, Peter, and Pyrrhus of Constantinople, Macarius of Antioch, along with his disciple, Stephen, are all mentioned by name. The last part of the confession includes the following:

I swear by the holy, consubstantial, and to-be-worshipped Trinity, apart from all deceit, to think this way and to accept nothing contrary to these things and not to have communion with someone of another faith who does not thus confess, especially with the Maronites.²¹⁰

As the incident from the *Maronite Chronicle*, cited above, suggested, it was only about seventy years previous to John's writing of the *De recta sententia* that the Maronites had been the dominant Chalcedonian group in the area. Marwān II's unsuccessful attempt to have the Dyothelite patriarch of Antioch, Theophylact bar Qanbara, use violence to force the monks of the Monastery of Maron and the Chalcedonians of Mabbug to accept the doctrine of Christ's two wills and the shorter Trisagion also took place in this period,

202 See Gribomont, "Documents" (n. 11 above), 115–18, esp. 116.

203 Though, to be sure, John may very well represent a continuation of the strong anti-Monenergist and Monothelete views of Sophronius and Maximus.

204 See above, n. 27.

205 *De duabus in Christo voluntatibus*, 173–231 in *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*, ed. P. B. Kotter, vol. 4 (Berlin and New York, 1981) (= PG 95:127–85).

206 See the title recorded in the *Admonitio* in PG 94:1421–22. Gribomont, "Documents," 109, dates the text to around 726 but gives no reason for this. He cites J. M. Hoeck, "Stand und Aufgaben der Damaskenos-Forschung," *OCP* 17 (1951): 19, n. 5, but Hoeck says nothing there about the work's date.

207 See Gribomont, "Documents," 109 and J. H. Lupton, "Joannes Damascenus," in *A Dictionary of Christian Biography*, ed. W. Smith and H. Wace, vol. 3 (London, 1882): 414 (no. III). O. Bardenhewer understood Elia to be a Miaphysite; see idem, *Patrology: The Lives and Works of the Fathers of the Church*, trans. T. J. Shahan (Freiburg im Breisgau and St. Louis, MO, 1908), 584.

208 See points three and four in the confession, PG 94:1428B–1429D. John also devoted a section of his *Expositio fidei* to discussing the "theandric energy" of Dionysius. See *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*, ed. Kotter, vol. 2 (Berlin and New York, 1973), 160–62.

209 PG 94:1429D. Note that John's discussion of the Trisagion comes immediately after his discussion of Christ's wills and energies—the question of Christ's wills and energies and the question of the Trisagion were commonly connected; see, e.g., notes 11 and 32, above.

210 My translation. PG 94:1432C: ἐξαίρετως τοῖς Μαρωνίταις. For these points about the Monothelete context of the *De recta sententia*, see Gribomont, "Documents," 109–10.

around 745, and suggests that the mid-eighth century was a time of intense Monothelite-Dyothelite rivalry in Syria.²¹¹ After John's death, in the late eighth or early ninth century, the Chalcedonian Dyothelite Timothy of Kākhushṭā would learn the craft of woodworking in a Syrian monastery from Monothelite Maronites. As Timothy worked, his *vita* tells us, he would attempt to prove to the Maronites from Scripture that Christ had two wills, but to no avail.²¹²

John's writings suggest that Monothelites were present in Palestine, too. Like his father before him, John was a proponent of the shorter version of the Trisagion, and among John's letters is one written to the Archimandrite Jordanes concerning the Hymn. The letter was occasioned by a certain Anastasius, the superior of the monastery of St. Euthymius, who had adduced a number of patristic testimonia that asserted that the Trisagion was directed to the Son alone²¹³—in other words, Anastasius was defending the longer version of the Hymn that was preferred by both Monothelites and Miaphysites. It has been suggested that this letter was directed against the Miaphysites,²¹⁴ but one intriguing line suggests that Anastasius may have been involved with another group John was not too fond of. "For if we speak the hymn only to the Son," he wrote, "the dispute has without a doubt been ended and we ourselves have become Maronites, adding the crucifixion to the Trisagion."²¹⁵ It very well may have been the case that what John was reacting to was in fact a community with a Monothelite heritage that was clinging to its traditional ways.²¹⁶

This presence of Monothelitism at the monastery of St. Euthymius in Palestine may seem a bit odd since Sophronius and Maximus, the two great proponents of Dyothelitism, were themselves either based in or associated with Palestine.²¹⁷ The idea of Palestinian Monothelitism, however, fits with the evidence given by Black's Christian Palestinian Aramaic *Horologion* that there were indeed Monothelites present in the Holy Land at one point. There are additional reasons for believing this to have been the case. A letter written by Stephen of Dor to Patriarch Paul of Constantinople, preserved in the Acts of the Lateran Synod of 649, for example, mentions that Sergius of Joppa took the position of *topoteretes* of Jerusalem for himself after the Persian withdrawal, using "worldly power" rather than ecclesiastical canons to accomplish this goal. He then ordained bishops under the jurisdiction of Jerusalem.²¹⁸ Stephen of Dor was a Dyothelite and Sergius of Joppa was a Monothelite, so it is difficult to know whether Sergius really did take the position of *topoteretes* of Jerusalem through inappropriate means, or whether this was a slander that an unhappy Stephen was laying against him and a group of Monothelite bishops in Palestine; the charge of being "puffed up with worldly power" was one that Syrian Miaphysites might use to denigrate Chalcedonians, too.²¹⁹ This incident probably occurred around 630 and points to a Monenergist or Monothelite presence, quite possibly significant, in Palestine at that time.²²⁰ Also worth noting is that

217 The Syriac *Life* of Maximus gives him a Palestinian origin and places him in the monastery of St. Chariton, as opposed to the Greek *Life*, which has him hailing from Constantinople. See Brock's discussion of the reliability of the Syriac *Life* in this respect, "Early Syriac Life of Maximus the Confessor" (n. 144 above), 340–42. Sophronius was born and educated in Damascus. See C. von Schönborn, *Sophrone de Jérusalem: Vie monastique et confession dogmatique* (Paris, 1972), 54–56.

218 See Winkelman, *Der monenergetisch-monothelische Streit*, 101, no. 74 and ACO 2.1:46.2–3: οὐκ ἀπό τινος ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἀκολουθίας ἀλλὰ κοσμικῆς ἐξουσίας.

219 My translation. For this phrase, see the second letter of George, Bishop of the Arab Tribes (d. 724), written in 715, in BL Add. 12,154, fol. 237b.

220 For this date and for Sergius of Joppa as a Monothelite, see Winkelman, *Der monenergetisch-monothelische Streit*, 260; see too his comments about Monothelites in Palestine and Syria, 101 (no. 74). Cf. also Schönborn, *Sophrone de Jérusalem*, 85–89, esp. 89: "Saint Sophrone eut donc à lutter non seulement à l'extérieur, mais encore à l'intérieur de son territoire où une pseudo-hiérarchie monothélite exerçait ses activités contre l'orthodoxie."

211 See above, notes 11 and 32.

212 J. C. Lamoreaux and C. Cairala, eds. and trans., *The Life of Timothy of Kākhushṭā*, PO 48 (Turnhout, 2000), 546 (Arabic = 547 Eng. trans.).

213 *Epistula de hymno trisagio* 1.18–23 in Kotter, *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*, 4:305.

214 See Hoeck, "Stand und Aufgaben," 22–23, note 8.

215 My translation. *Epistula de hymno trisagio* 5.32–34 in Kotter, *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*, 4:313. Εἰ γὰρ εἰς τὸν υἱὸν μόνον τὸν τρισάγιον φήσομεν ὕμνον, λέγεται τὸ ἀμφίβολον ἀνευδοιάστως, καὶ ἡμεῖς μαρωνήσωμεν, προσθῶμεν τῷ τρισάγιῳ τὴν σταύρωσιν. For more on the Trisagion, see S. P. Brock, "Thrice-Holy Hymn" (n. 5 above) and also idem, "The Origins of the Qanona 'Holy God, Holy Mighty, Holy Immortal' according to Gabriel of Qatar (Early 7th Century)," *The Harp* 21 (2006): 173–85. I am grateful to Lucas van Rompay for referring me to the latter article.

216 On this letter, see Gribomont, "Documents," 110–11.

George of Resh'ayna, the author of the *Monothelite Syriac Life* of Maximus, identified himself as being under the jurisdiction of Sophronius, and he himself was likely a bishop.²²¹ A series of letters written by Pope Martin provides more evidence for Palestinian Monothelitism and suggests that Monothelite presence in Palestine was strong enough to attract Martin's attention across the Mediterranean in Rome. Most of Martin's letters sent to Palestine were written to bishops east of the Jordan—in Ebus, Bakatha, and Philadelphia—indicating perhaps that west of the Jordan the Pope's Dyothelite views had fewer sympathizers.²²² Milka Levy-Rubin has closely examined these letters and other evidence for Palestinian Monothelitism and argued that it had widespread sympathy there in the seventh century; Dyothelites seemed to have been concentrated mainly in a few monasteries in the Judean Desert and several places in Transjordan. These few places, she has suggested, were, in fact, perhaps the most important centers of Dyothelitism in all of Palestine and Syria.²²³

There were Monothelites outside of Syria and Palestine as well. In Constantinople, for example, there seemed to have been strong Monothelite elements. This, at least, is an inference that has been made from the fact that Paul, a Monothelite, was chosen to succeed Pyrrhus as Patriarch of Constantinople after the latter was deposed. Paul's elevation to the Patriarchate took place in 641, when the Emperor Constans II was only eleven years old. Senatorial regents were ruling the empire and their choice of a Monothelite patriarch suggests that they themselves were pro-Monothelite.²²⁴

221 See Brock, "Early Syriac Life," 332–35.

222 For Martin's letters to John of Philadelphia, Theodore of Ebus, Anthony of Bakatha, the archimandrite of the monastery of Theodosius, and Pantaleon of Jerusalem, see Winkelmann, *Der monenergetisch-monothelitishe Streit*, 131–32 (nos. 116–20).

223 Levy-Rubin, "Role of the Judean Desert Monasteries" (n. 5 above), 294–95, 299.

224 This is Judith Herrin's point in eadem, *The Formation of Christendom* (London, 1987), 217. Allen and Neil suggest that the anonymous Dyothelite tract *Contra Constantinopolitanos* was written at some point after 662. For comments on authorship and date, see eadem, *Scripta saeculi VII*, XXIII. The text can be found on 230–32. An anonymous reader has suggested to me that Constans's letter to Pope John IV, which affirms a belief in two natures, two wills, and two energies, should perhaps temper Herrin's suggestion. For the letter, see Cheikho, Carra de Vaux, and Zayyat, *Eutychii Patriarchae Alexandrini Annales* (n. 160 above), 31 (the full exchange

Constantinopolitan Monothelitism may also be inferred from the trials there of Pope Martin in 653 and of Maximus and his disciples in 662. The presence of Monothelite elements at Constantinople may also help explain its brief reinstitution as the official imperial position during the short reign of Philippicus Bardanes in the early eighth century; though the stance was not received well in Rome, it encountered little difficulty with the clergy of Constantinople.²²⁵

There must have been Monenergists in Egypt as well—after all, it was the *Pact of Union* between the Miaphysite Theodosians and Chalcedonians in 633 that had touched off the entire controversy. The Miaphysite *History of the Patriarchs of Alexandria* painted a rather grim picture of the fate of the Egyptian Miaphysite church under Heraclius and Cyrus:

And on account of the greatness of the trials and the straits and the affliction which the

between John IV, Constans, and Heraclius is on 28–32). This article is not the place to engage in detailed discussion of this particular document, but I believe that the authenticity of the letter exchange between Pope John IV and the emperors should not be assumed uncritically as it is by Jankowiak in "Invention of Dyothelitism" (n. 7 above), 339–40. The reference to Constans's letter in Eutychius appears only in the longer and much interpolated "Antiochian" recension of the chronicle, published most recently by Cheikho, Carra de Vaux, and Zayyat, and does not appear in the "Alexandrian" recension—potentially the autograph of the work—published by Breydy on the basis of Sinai Arabic 582 (for the Alexandrian recension of Eutychius, see M. Breydy, *Das Annalenwerk des Eutychios von Alexandrien*, CSCO 471–72, *Scriptores Arabici* 44–45 [Louvain, 1985]). Although the Alexandrian recension is damaged at the point where the letter occurs, preventing a comparison with the Antiochian recension, Breydy argued that the Antiochian recension's account of the exchange and the sixth council more generally represented an interpolation; see idem, *Études sur Sa'īd ibn Baṭṭiq et ses sources*, CSCO 450, *Subsidia* 69 (Louvain, 1983), 76–78. In addition to the text found in Eutychius, J. Schacht, "Der Briefwechsel zwischen Kaiser und Papst von 641/2 in arabischer Überlieferung," *Orientalia* n. s. 5 (1936): 229–68, published a version of the exchange, but reference should also be made to M. Breydy's criticism of the errors of Schacht's edition and its reliance on a single, late manuscript (Vatican Syriac 130, from 1690): See Breydy, *Études*, 77, n. 5. Before Schacht, Iṣṭifān al-Duwayhī, *Ta'rikh al-ṭā'ifa al-Mārūniyya* (Beirut, 1890), 316–28, provided the Arabic text of John's letter to Constans and Heraclius alongside an Arabic translation of Anastasius Bibliothecarius's Latin version. Further study needs to be made of the manuscript tradition, witnesses, and evidence for the letter exchange before it can be cited with confidence.

225 For this point, see J. Haldon, *Byzantium in the Seventh Century* (Cambridge, 1990), 79.

Colchian [sc. Cyrus] brought down upon the orthodox, in order that they might enter into the Chalcedonian faith, a countless number of them went astray, some of them through persecution, and some by bribes and honours, and some by persuasion and deceit. So that even Cyrus, bishop of Niciu and Victor, bishop of the Faiyūm, and many others denied the orthodox faith, because they had not obeyed the injunction of the blessed Father Benjamin [the Miaphysite Patriarch] and had not hidden themselves as the others did, for the Colchian caught them with the fishing-line of his error, and so they went astray after the impure Chalcedonian council.²²⁶

Though hostile, this account of the activities of Cyrus in Alexandria does corroborate a letter written by Cyrus to Sergius in the aftermath of the union of 633. Preserved in the acta of the Sixth Council, the letter states that all of the Theodosian clerics of Alexandria, as well as notables, soldiers, and thousands of common people had come into union with the catholic (i.e., Chalcedonian) church and taken communion.²²⁷ The *History of the Patriarchs* does report that after the Arab conquest, Patriarch Benjamin came out of hiding and “drew to himself most of the people whom Heraclius, the heretical prince, had led astray.” Nevertheless, it also contains the following telling admission of a continued Monenergist-Monothelete unionist presence in Egypt:

So likewise, the bishops, who had denied their faith [Benjamin] invited to return to the orthodox creed, and some of them returned with abundant tears; but the others would not return through shame before men, that it should be known among them that they had denied the faith, and so they remained in their disbelief until they died.²²⁸

226 Trans. B. Evetts, *History of the Patriarchs of the Coptic Church of Alexandria II: Peter I to Benjamin I (661)*, PO 1 (Paris, 1907), 491.

227 See ACO 2.2.2:592.13–17 and Winkelmann, *Der monenergetisch-monotheletische Streit*, 67 (no. 28). An English translation of the letter is available in Allen, *Sophronius of Jerusalem* (n. 41 above), 175–77.

228 Trans. Evetts, *History*, 497.

Whether it was really shame that kept these Miaphysites-turned-Chalcedonians from rejecting Chalcedon anew is an open question.²²⁹ What is important here is the intimation of a continuing presence of Monenergist-Monothelete Chalcedonians in Egypt, some of whom were Miaphysite unionists. The size of this group is hard to gauge. The fact that Benjamin’s Paschal letter of 642 affirmed a view that Christ had only one energy²³⁰ also suggests that the borders between Monenergists/Monotheletes and Miaphysites in Alexandria may have been somewhat blurry. This is also suggested by a Greek papyrus fragment of another Paschal letter of Benjamin, from AD 663. In that letter, the same four patristic citations (among them Dionysius’s reference to theandric energy from the fourth epistle) appear as can be found in the later *Doctrina Patrum*, where they are referred to as being put forth by “opponents” and given properly Orthodox interpretations. In the context, the *Doctrina Patrum*’s “opponents” were probably Monotheletes or Monenergists and it seems that both Benjamin and the *Doctrina Patrum* were using a now-lost Monenergist-Monothelete *florilegium*.²³¹ Benjamin’s Paschal letter of AD 663 and the *Doctrina Patrum* therefore possibly bear indirect witness to continuing Monenergist-Monothelete elements in mid- to late seventh century Alexandria.

And there is other evidence that Monotheletes or Monenergists continued to exist in Egypt even after the Islamic conquests allowed the Miaphysite hierarchy

229 F. Winkelmann, “Ägypten und Byzanz vor der Arabischen Eroberung,” *BSI* 40 (1979): 172, for instance, thinks that the Miaphysite conversions were serious and holds that the claim that it was shame that kept some Miaphysites from rejecting Monenergism after the Arab conquests and returning to their original belief is not persuasive.

230 For a fragment of the sixteenth festal letter preserved in Arabic and with a Monenergist affirmation, see G. Graf, “Zwei dogmatische Florilegien der Kopten,” *OCP* 3 (1937): 394. For the same passage in the Ethiopic version of the sixteenth festal letter, see C. D. G. Müller, *Die Homilie über die Hochzeit zu Kana und weitere Schriften des Patriarchen Benjamin I. von Alexandrien* (Heidelberg, 1968), 351 (n. 5 gives the connection to Graf’s Arabic text).

231 See U. Hagedorn and D. Hagedorn, “Monotheletisch interpretierte Väterzitate und eine Anleihe bei Johannes Chrysostomus in dem Kölner Osterfestbrief (P. Köln V 215),” *ZPapEpiG* 178 (2011): 143–45. For the διδασκαλίας πατέρων, ἃς προβάλλονται οἱ ἀντιδιατιθέμενοι, see Diekamp, *Doctrina Patrum* (n. 88 above), 130.1–2.

to reassert itself. Preserved in the *Doctrina Patrum* are anathemas from the synodal letter of Sophronius of Jerusalem (634);²³² included in the names are the usual suspects: Cyrus of Alexandria, Theodore of Pharan, Sergius of Constantinople, Pope Honorius, Pyrrhus, Paul and Peter of Constantinople, Macarius of Antioch, Stephen, and Polychronius. Also included, however, is someone new: a certain Harmasius who lived in Alexandria, and who, the text says, “battles the truth up till now.”²³³

The passage about Harmasius in the *Doctrina Patrum* presents us with a problem of anachronism—Sophronius seemed to be excommunicating people in 634 who were not even players in the controversy yet: Macarius of Antioch was not patriarch until some time in the 660s, probably even the late 660s.²³⁴ Some interpolation has occurred and in fact this whole section of names, from Cyrus to Harmasius, cannot be found in the letter of Sophronius as it is recorded in the acts of the Sixth Council;²³⁵ Diekamp suggested that it would have been difficult for this addition to have been written before 685.²³⁶ Thus we have an attestation to a Monenergist or Monothelete group in Alexandria in the late seventh century even after Patriarch Benjamin had attempted to bring unionist Miaphysites back into his fold.

That Harmasius and his followers were in fact Monenergist is something we can be more sure about because of Anastasius of Sinai. Harmasius appears in only two other places, both in *scholia* of Anastasius’s *Viae Dux*.²³⁷ The more important of these occurs in chapter 13, where a *scholion* on an aporetic question designed to confound Miaphysites notes that when used against “Harmasians,” the question should not be couched in terms of “one nature,” but rather in terms of “theandric energy.”²³⁸ Once again, we encounter

the importance of Dionysius’s fourth epistle to the Monenergist cause. Though Monenergists do not make an appearance in his *Questions and Answers*, Anastasius too was aware of the presence and threat of Monenergists and Monotheletes. His third homily on the creation of man in the image of God, for example, is written against the Monotheletes and even contains a short history of Monotheletism;²³⁹ Anastasius also compiled an anti-Monothelete florilegium and wrote five *kephalaia* against Monotheletism.²⁴⁰ Richard’s close examination of the *Viae Dux* led him to the conclusion that its author was “at war” with Monotheletism and was utilizing a sophisticated set of tools to combat it.²⁴¹ Here we have yet one more location in the eastern Mediterranean where there was an awareness of the presence and threat of Monenergism and Monotheletism. And as was the case with the Monenergism of the Miaphysite patriarch Benjamin, the borders between Monenergists-Monotheletes and Miaphysites may have continued to be hazy well after the Arab conquests—in the early eighth century, the Coptic patriarch Alexander II’s Paschal letter, written in Greek, would affirm both Monenergist and Monothelete Christological positions.²⁴²

Viewed as a whole, all of these pieces of evidence—passing references in texts, brief episodes in chronicles, tantalizing survivals in out-of-the-way manuscripts, polemical treatises—cannot give us much information about the actual numbers of Monenergists or Monotheletes that existed in the seventh and eighth centuries. When combined with the testimony of Michael the Great, however, they suggest that the number of Monenergists and Monotheletes was significant,

232 On this letter, see Winkelmann, *Der monenergetisch-monotheletische Streit*, 80–82, no. 45.

233 My translation. Diekamp, *Doctrina Patrum*, 271.14.

234 Cf. Brandes, “Melkitische Patriarchen von Antiocheia” (n. 127 above), 51.

235 See Diekamp, *Doctrina Patrum*, 271, note.

236 Ibid., LXXX. Winkelmann follows Uthemann and places the date between 686 and 689, see *Der monenergetisch-monotheletische Streit*, 176.

237 For this point, see Diekamp, *Doctrina Patrum*, LXXIX.

238 Anastasius of Sinai, *Viae Dux*, ed. K.-H. Uthemann, CCSG 8 (Turnhout, 1981), 231 (XIII.6.17–20).

239 Uthemann, *Sermones Duo* (n. 157 above), 55–83; the history of Monenergism-Monotheletism is on 56–61 (cf. n. 151 above). On this text, see Winkelmann, *Der monenergetisch-monotheletische Streit*, 177, no. 175, where he follows Uthemann and dates the homily to 701.

240 For the florilegium, see Uthemann, *Sermones Duo*, 87–96; the *kephalaia* can be found on 157.

241 M. Richard, “Anastase le Sinaïte, l’Hodegos et le Monothélisme,” in *Opera Minora*, vol. 3 (Turnhout, 1977), no. 63, originally printed in *RÉB* 16 (1958): 29–42 (reference to Anastasius “en guerre contre le monothélisme” on 41). See also Winkelmann, *Der monenergetisch-monotheletische Streit*, 175, no. 173.

242 See C. Schmidt and W. Schubart, *Berliner Klassikertexte*, vol. 6, *Altchristliche Texte* (Berlin, 1910), 82.252 and L. S. B. MacCoull, “The Paschal Letter of Alexander II, Patriarch of Alexandria: A Greek Defense of Coptic Theology under Arab Rule,” *DOP* 44 (1990): 33, 37–38.

especially in Greater Syria. Accounts of Monenergism and Monotheletism that attempt to portray them as politically motivated compromises cannot account for this evidence in an adequate way.²⁴³

A satisfying account of Monenergism and Monotheletism would locate its origins in discussions of the numbers of wills and energies of Christ that extended back into the sixth century and the theological milieu of the Fifth Council.²⁴⁴ This interest continued into the seventh century among Chalcedonians, but also, it should be emphasized, among Miaphysites.²⁴⁵ When the union between Chalcedonians and Miaphysites took place in 633 in Alexandria, there was no consensus among Chalcedonians as to exactly how many wills and energies there actually are in Christ. The deliberations held at a synod held in Cyprus ca. 636, which I have referred to above, make this clear. Though the only report of this synod's occurrence comes in the *Syriac Life* of Maximus, Brock has argued that we should accept the synod as actually having occurred.²⁴⁶ There were, according to the *vita*, forty-six people at the synod: Pope Honorius sent a representative, Sergius of Constantinople sent his archdeacon, Cyrus of Alexandria came with five of his bishops, Sophronius came with eight of his bishops—in short, every major apostolic see (except for Antioch, which at the time had no patriarch) was represented. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss Maximus's views of the shorter version of the Trisagion and whether there were two energies and wills in Christ. "After much had been

said," George, the author of the *vita* and also a participant in the synod, wrote, "some of the bishops were saying that 'we should accept Maximus's doctrine,' while others said, 'No, it is pernicious,' and they decided to put this doctrine down in writing and send it to the victorious Emperor Heraclius."²⁴⁷

Quite simply, there were different views held on this issue: none had yet achieved hegemonic status. Indeed, doctrinal positions in the early 630s were perhaps much more fluid than we now realize. A letter Maximus wrote to Pyrrhus around 634, though in some respects critical and questioning, nevertheless accepted the *Psephos* of Sergius, which had forbidden speaking about either one or two energies in Christ.²⁴⁸ In the letter, Maximus had lavished such praise on Pyrrhus that Maximus would later face criticism and suspicion on its account and have to try to explain it away.²⁴⁹ This led François-Marie Léthel to suggest that the difference between Maximus and his opponents, at least at the beginning of the controversy, was perhaps not so large.²⁵⁰ Richard Price has argued that the differences between Monenergism and Dyenergism were in fact mostly a matter of differing vocabulary and not actually substantive.²⁵¹

I have resisted bringing politics into my discussion up till this point in order to avoid a reductivist approach to a religious controversy, but political considerations did play a role in the Monothelete-Monenergist controversy, if not in creating the doctrines which sparked it, then at least in forcing the issue in 633 and thereby

243 Levy-Rubin, "Role" (n. 5 above), 284–89 lays out the two broad approaches that have been taken to the Monothelete controversy, one that sees Monotheletism as an artificial imposition and a second that sees it as having strong and organic roots in the east.

244 See above, n. 111. Hovorun distinguishes among at least four different types of Monenergism that developed from the fourth through the seventh century. Hovorun, *Will, Action and Freedom* (n. 3 above), 5.

245 BL Add. 14,604, a Syriac Miaphysite manuscript from the seventh century, contains a number of texts—scholia of Cyril of Alexandria on the Incarnation, Philoxenus of Mabbug against Nestorians, the fourth letter of Ps-Dionysius, and several Apollinarian works on the Incarnation, attributed to Julian of Rome—which suggests that Miaphysites at this time were reading many of the same works that Monotheletes were. For the manuscript's description, see W. Wright, *Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum, Acquired since the Year 1838*, vol. 2 (London, 1871), 724–26.

246 Brock, "Early Syriac Life," 342.

247 Trans. Brock, *ibid.*, 316, no. 12. See also Winkelmann, *Der monenergetisch-monotheletische Streit*, 70–71, no. 33.

248 ACO 2.2.2:542.2–3. On the *Psephos*, which was written in 633, see Winkelmann, *Der monenergetisch-monotheletische Streit*, 73–74, no. 36.

249 Epistle 19, PG 91:589–97, French trans. in Ponsoye, *Saint Maxime le Confesseur* (n. 82 above), 198–202. For Maximus's backpedaling his praise, see PG 91:129–132 (French translation in Ponsoye, *Saint Maxime le Confesseur*, 180–81). See the comments and description in Winkelmann, *Der monenergetisch-monotheletische Streit*, 77, no. 42 and 119–20, no. 102.

250 F.-M. Léthel, *Théologie de l'agonie du Christ*, *Théologie Historique* 52 (Paris, 1979), 64: "Il n'y a donc pas, au départ, de divergence profonde entre la christologie de Maxime et celle des monotheletes de Byzance." See also Herrin, *Formation of Christendom*, 208. But Sherwood, *Annotated Date-List* (n. 115 above), 9–12, is less keen to see any latent Monenergist or Monothelete tendencies in Maximus's stance in the letter.

251 See Price, "Monotheletism" (n. 94 above), 221–32.

triggering the doctrinal conflict through which it came to be resolved at the Sixth Council. Political considerations may have also played a role in the defeat of Monotheletism at the actual Sixth Ecumenical Council in 680–681—by this period, with the exception of the capital of Constantinople itself, the regions where Monotheletism was the strongest were under Islamic rule and, therefore, they were scarcely represented at the council. Indeed, Michael the Great claimed that there were no bishops from Egypt, Syria, Palestine, or Armenia present at the Sixth Council.²⁵² With regions where Miaphysitism and Monenergism-Monotheletism were particularly strong no longer part of the empire, the appetite for accommodating these views must have been rather small. In Michael the Great's admittedly tendentious account of the council, Theodore, the papal representative, paid the emperor to accept the doctrine of the two wills; new, more doctrinally pliant patriarchs were given to Alexandria and Jerusalem; and Macarius of Antioch fought valiantly and unsuccessfully for the doctrine of one will against Roman forces. In the end, the emperor forced the bishops present to sign the definition.²⁵³

Brock's Monothelete fragment on the Sixth Council from the British Library also voices complaints about the behavior of Constantine IV at the council. Of the six reasons stated for rejecting the Synod, the lengthiest one relates to Constantine IV being called "the New David," and having his two brothers mutilated, his mother sent into exile, and crucifying and executing twelve mutineers—all in the middle of the council. Brock suggested that this fragment was written in the aftermath of 680–81 and contained information from "the entourage of

Macarius."²⁵⁴ More Monothelete dissatisfaction about the political machinations that took place at the Sixth Ecumenical Council can be seen in one of the Arabic *memre* of Theodore Abū Qurra (ca. 740–ca. 820), a Chalcedonian Dyothelete bishop of Harran.²⁵⁵ In a long and wide-ranging homily on the truth of the Christian religion, Theodore chastised Jews, Jacobites, Nestorians, and Maronites. The point of contention with the imaginary Maronite interlocutor he confronts is the Sixth Ecumenical Council that the Maronite has rejected. One of Theodore's counterarguments was that if the Maronite rejected the Sixth Council, he should reject previous councils as well. "Every heretic who has been cast away in one of these Councils," Theodore told him, "has used the same excuse as you and says that the emperor who gathered that council is the one who forced people to expel him [sc. the heretic] and through [the emperor's] coercion that council was gathered against him."²⁵⁶ Decades after the Sixth Council had met, bitter memories of the way it was carried out still persisted among Monotheletes. In the eleventh century, Thomas of Kafartāb would acridly point out the lack of Christian charity that Dyotheletes had shown toward other Christians:

As for you, O followers of Maximus, you have taken for yourselves a curse which you use to curse all Christians without just cause. But

252 The presence lists of the Sixth Council show that this charge is very nearly true. Of all the bishops present at the council and not counting the Patriarch of Antioch, only three seem to have been from Armenia, Egypt, or Syria: the Bishop of Herakleupolis-Pedachthoë in Armenia II, the Bishop of Sebasteia in Armenia II, and the bishop of Melitene. Also perhaps present was an Egyptian bishop, if Leontoupolis was in Egypt. For these, see R. Riedinger, *Die Präsenz- und Subskriptionslisten des VI. Oekumenischen Konzils (680–681) und der Papyrus Vind. G.3* (Munich, 1979), 16, 20, 22, and 22, respectively. I am grateful to an anonymous reader for pointing out that Constantinople was also a strongly Monothelete area until Constantine IV forcefully sided with Roman Dyotheletes.

253 *Chronique de Michel le Syrien*, 4:433–34 = 2:452 (French translation). See also Brock, "Early Syriac Life" (n. 144 above), 344.

254 Brock, "Syriac Fragment" (n. 85 above); the statement about information coming from Macarius's entourage is on 71, the objections with Brock's English translation, which I have used, are on 64–65.

255 Cf. Gribomont, "Documents" (n. 11 above), 113.

256 My translation. Theodore Abū Qurra, "Mīmar fī Ṣiḥḥat al-Dīn al-Masīḥī," *al-Machriq* 6 (1903): 804. NB: Constantine Bacha published this *memra* two different times, in the periodical *al-Machriq* and also in a book which contains a collection of Theodore's works, *Mayāmir Thāwādūrūs Abī Qurra* (Beirut, n.d.). In both places, rather than putting *Yā Mārūnī* (O, Maronite!) in the text of the *memra* when Theodore addresses the Maronite, he writes instead *Yā (Munūthilī)* (O, [Monothelete!]). For these alterations, see 802 and 803 in the *al-Machriq* publication of the *memra*, and 169 and 171 in *Mayāmir Thāwādūrūs Abī Qurra*. (In the latter work, he substitutes *Yā Munūthilī* for *Yā Mārūnī*.) Graf's German translation of the *memre* of Theodore renders the passages in question as "O, Maronite!" ("o Maronit") without any use of parentheses. See G. Graf, *Die arabischen Schriften des Theodor Abū Qurra, Bischofs von Harran (ca. 740–820)* (Paderborn, 1910), 117, 119. The English translation in J. C. Lamoreaux, *Theodore Abū Qurrah* (Provo, 2005), 73–74, also reads "Maronite" in this passage.

we have rejoiced—as the Gospel says: “Blessed are you if you are cursed unjustly. Rejoice and be glad, for your reward is great in heaven” (cf. Mt. 5:11) . . . We pray for your kings and for you and for all of our Christian brethren. But you have taken for yourselves a curse [with] which you curse the Nestorians, the Franks, the Ethiopians, the Copts, the Maronites, the Jacobites, the Armenians, and every tribe of believers, on every feast and at every gathering. But we have realized, with justice, that your curse will return to you and will be on your head. Amen.²⁵⁷

Both Theodore Abū Qurra and Thomas of Kafarṭāb serve as reminders of an important fact: it is only in Syria that we find extensive evidence for Monothelete communities beyond this period and it is only in Syria that an actual Monothelete church comes into existence. Indeed, more evidence could be cited for the continued existence of Monotheletes in Syria into the medieval period, but that will take us too far afield.²⁵⁸

To return to a point I attempted to make at the beginning of this article: the presence and persistence of Monenergist and later, Monothelete, communities in Syria is a historical fact that sits uncomfortably with any view of Monenergism and Monotheletism as an artificial doctrine whose origins lay in elite circles, for

the simple reason that communities of Monenergists and Monotheletes actually existed, in nonelite circles, and evidence suggests that these groups saw themselves as being in faithful continuity with the orthodox past. Explaining the existence of Syrian Monotheletism by reference to the Arab conquest—Syrian Monotheletes survived because they were able to escape eventual imperial suppression in a way that Monotheletes in, say, Constantinople were not—raises the question of why nothing like a Monothelete church survived in Alexandria. Where is our Egyptian analogue to the Maronites? It might be suggested that Monotheletes in Syria adopted the doctrine of the one will to assure the new Arab rulers that they were theologically different from their Byzantine rivals. This hypothesis suffers from the simple problem that there is absolutely no evidence whatsoever to substantiate it and again raises the question of why this happened only in Syria and not also in Egypt.²⁵⁹ What is more, suggestions along either one of these lines are also unaware of Umayyad attempts at imposing Dyothelete belief and the shorter Trisagion on Maronites through violence and financial penalty.²⁶⁰ For any student of the Monenergist-Monothelete controversy, the continuing existence of Monotheletes in Syria is a puzzle that needs further explanation.

The presence, persistence, and even flowering of Syrian Monotheletism likewise presents a difficulty for Marek Jankowiak’s recent argument that Monotheletism was not “born” until 635 and only “endowed with a full doctrinal framework only several years later.”²⁶¹ If Monotheletism represents the case of

257 My translation. Chartouni, *Traité* (n. 41 above), 28–29 (Arabic; 95 French trans.). For Thomas speaking about praying for all Christian kings, see 32 (97 trans.).

258 Būlus al-Rāhib (also known as Paul the Monk of Antioch), for example, in the thirteenth century, would write a treatise about the four different Christian groups that existed “in our time.” Among these were the Maronites, who were Monotheletes, and Būlus writes against the notion that Christ had one will. See L. Cheikho, “Maqāla li-Būluṣ al-Rāhib usquf Ṣaydā’ fī ‘l-firaq al-muta’ārifa bayna al-Naṣārā,” *al-Machriq* 7 (1904): 702–9. (NB: Cheikho’s placement of parentheses around the words “Monothelete” and “Monotheletes”—e.g., 702, 704, 706—suggest that he has replaced the original text’s “Maronite” or “Maronites” with these words.) For more evidence on the equation of Maronites and Monotheletes see, e.g., Ajam, “Monothélisme” (n. 166 above) and F. Carcione, *Le genesi storico-teologica del monotelismo maronita: Note per una lettura ortodossa della tradizione cristologica maronita* (Rome, 1990), 43–54 and S. Suermann, “Sulamān al-Gazzī, évêque melchite de Gaza XI^e siècle, sur les maronites,” *Parole de l’Orient* 21 (1996): 189–98. More generally, Gribomont, “Documents,” represents a fundamental piece of research and synthesis that I have relied upon a great deal throughout this article.

259 Though I find them unpersuasive, I am grateful to an anonymous reader for suggesting these last two explanations of Syrian Monotheletism.

260 See above, notes 11 and 32.

261 Jankowiak, “Invention of Dyotheletism” (n. 7 above), 38, 342. Jankowiak, 338, writes that “Honorius was not the first Chalcedonian to confess one will of Christ, but was the first pope to endow it with the authority of the Holy See.” It should, however, be pointed out, as I have tried to argue above, that Monotheletes were convinced that Pope Vigilius’s acceptance of the address of Menas—which affirmed one will in Christ—amounted to just this, a papal endorsement of the view that Christ had one will. Sergius was using the address as early as 620 (see above, n. 46) and in his first letter to Cyrus, written around 626, he not only referenced the address of Menas which affirmed both one will and one energy in Christ, but also apparently appended unnamed patristic testimonia to the letter which would support this claim (see above, n. 42). The great authority of

a doctrine that came into being in elite circles in the Roman Empire, accidentally, and in an unintended and unplanned way, how did it manage to migrate outside the empire—the Arabs had conquered Damascus and Antioch by 637, Jerusalem by 638, and Edessa by 639—and find its staunchest and most insistent adherents speaking Syriac, not Greek or Latin? By what mechanisms did an accidental, imperial doctrine come to flourish in areas beyond imperial control and even in the face of violence sanctioned by Muslim authorities? Any account of the Monothelete controversy which sees Monenergism or Monotheletism as an artificial and elite phenomenon must offer some sort of explanation for the continued existence of a significant body of Christians confessing these allegedly artificial and elite doctrines in Arab-ruled Syria.

Jankowiak's argument has the virtue of historical nuance and consciousness of the fluid and evolving nature of concepts and doctrines, but its weaknesses highlight the challenges that confront the historian seeking to explain and understand the Monenergist-Monothelete controversy. Exceedingly few sources written by consciously Monenergist or Monothelete figures have survived, and the only such sources that have survived and that have not been transmitted via hostile Dyothelete texts are in Syriac, Christian Palestinian Aramaic, or Arabic—not Greek.²⁶² As a

the address of Menas was in part a function of the fact that it had been accepted by the pope: "Moreover, Menas, too, [now] among the saints, archbishop of this God-protected and imperial city, composed a document addressed to Vigilius, who was then the most holy pope of Older Rome, in which he too in the same way defined that the will of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ is one and also that there is one life-giving activity" (trans. Allen, *Sophronius of Jerusalem*, 165).

262 Surprisingly little Maronite literature has been transmitted from before the early modern period. H. Husmann, for example, knew of only four Maronite liturgical manuscripts from before the sixteenth century; see idem, "Die Gesänge der syrischen Liturgien," in *Geschichte der katholischen Kirchenmusik*, ed. K. G. Fellerer (Kassel, 1972), 84. No evidence for Maronite synods exists before the sixteenth century (see H. Kaufhold, "Sources of Canon Law in the Eastern Churches," in *The History of Byzantine and Eastern Canon Law to 1500*, ed. W. Hartmann and K. Pennington [Washington, DC, 2012], 262), and Georg Graf described only a handful of Maronite writers or texts before the fifteenth century (see idem, *Geschichte der Christlichen Arabischen Literatur*, vol. 2 [Rome, 1947], 94–102). Kamal Salibi suggested that the paucity of Maronite historical texts before the fifteenth century was the result of the deliberate destruction of material which showed a Maronite-Monothelete connection by pro-Roman, Unionist elements in the Maronite church

result, strong statements about what Monenergists or Monotheletes may or may not have believed by certain dates, and attempts to definitively separate the two doctrines, should be made with a certain amount of fear and trembling.²⁶³ And, even though they may not have been self-consciously Monothelete or Monenergist, authors before the seventh century did in fact speak of Christ as having one energy and even one will.²⁶⁴

Conclusion

Though the Monenergists and, eventually, the Monotheletes lost, and most of their voices have

at that time; see idem, "The Traditional Historiography of the Maronites," in *Historians of the Middle East*, ed. B. Lewis and P. M. Holt (London, 1962), 213.

263 Jankowiak's comment, "Even though anti-Monothelete polemicists insisted that one will inevitably implied one activity, no Monothelete subscribed to such a view" ("Invention of Dyotheletism," 336), is perhaps a little too optimistic about what can be said with confidence about the precise nuances of Monothelete views. Such assertions might be better warranted if we had a significant body of theological writing from any sixth- or seventh-century Monenergist figure. With this said, it should be recalled that the address of Menas explicitly stated belief in both one will and one energy in Christ and was used as early as 620 by Sergius in his letter to Theodore of Pharan (see above, n. 46), was cited by Pyrrhus against Maximus (see above, n. 113), was repudiated as a forgery by the Sixth Council (see above n. 128), and also appeared in Brock's Monothelete florilegium. It is also worth pointing out that the discussion between the emperor Justinian and the East Syrian (or "Nestorian") Paul of Nisibis (Guillaumont, "Justinien et l'Église de Perse") is preserved in BL Add. 14,535, the same manuscript that preserves Brock's Monothelete florilegium. Uthemann, "Der Neuchalkedonismus" (n. 9 above), 390–91, cited this discussion between Paul and Justinian as an important witness to Justinian's belief in a single hypostatic energy, though Uthemann did not apparently realize that the text had been transmitted in a Monothelete manuscript, the compiler of which seems to have seen some connection between belief in one will and belief in one energy—precisely the stance, Jankowiak suggests, no Monothelete took. I am grateful to Lucas van Rompay for pointing out to me the connection between Brock's florilegium and Guillaumont's text on Justinian and Paul's discussion.

264 In addition to the texts contained in Brock's Monothelete florilegium, the testimony of Dyothelete collections of heretical florilegia comprising Miaphysite authors asserting one energy in Christ suggests there was a pre-seventh-century life to some of these ideas, though, to be sure, not articulated in the same way a seventh-century Monenergist or Monothelete would have (see above, n. 88). For pre-seventh-century Monenergist language, in addition to Lange, *Mia energeia* (n. 4 above), see Hovorun, *Will, Action, and Freedom* (n. 3 above), 5–51.

perished as a result, it is important to emphasize that Monenergism and Monotheletism were in fact views that came to hold regional doctrinal hegemonies, at least among Chalcedonian communities, and were not artificial concoctions. The evidence I cited above from the Coptic *History of the Patriarchs* suggests that unionist groups of Miaphysites-turned-Chalcedonians continued to exist in Alexandria until some point after the Arab conquests. These groups, however, have essentially vanished from the historical record—not unlike, perhaps, the followers of Gaianus, an important Julianist Miaphysite leader in sixth-century Alexandria from whom we have virtually no surviving texts. I have tried to show that in Syria, by contrast, evidence exists that suggests the existence of Monothelete communities well beyond the seventh century.

If Monenergist views existed among real groups of individuals before Sergius and Heraclius, and Monenergist and Monothelete views continued to exist after the Sixth Council, especially in Syria, what are we then to make of Monenergism and Monotheletism? How should we view this controversy if there is more to the story than failed politics and artificial doctrines? How can we address the problem that the existence and persistence of Syrian Monotheletism presents?

In 1951, Henry Chadwick argued for the importance that the personal devotion of monks with Miaphysite Christologies played in motivating the theological conflict of the Nestorian controversy;²⁶⁵ Chadwick attempted to show that there was a connection between devotion and doctrine in that dispute. Once this has been realized, the Nestorian controversy seems less rarefied and more human. Fueling the dispute was not a pedantic concern for ethereal philosophical and theological concepts: at stake were ways of life and systems of devotion that were embedded in and undergirded by the differing theologies.²⁶⁶ The same sort of argument needs to be made with regard to the Monenergist-Monothelete controversy. Politics played a role, as it did in every major ecclesiastical conflict in late antiquity, but any theological dispute which centers on

the nature of human willing and Christ's willing and which produced communities that lasted for centuries also demands an analysis that takes Christian devotion and the authenticity of Monothelete belief seriously. This paper is not the place to undertake such an exploration, but if we are to explain why Macarius of Antioch would defiantly express to a council his willingness to undergo physical mutilation for his Monothelete beliefs and why Maximus did in fact experience amputation for his Dyotheletism, more than imperial and ecclesiastical politics needs to be invoked. Historians need to consider what sort of connection might have existed between the *lex orandi* and the *lex credendi* in this dispute.

The great amount of Dyothelete literature that has come down to us provides a fertile ground for such analysis undertaken from a Dyothelete perspective. But what can we say of Monenergism-Monotheletism?

The most important Monothelete theological treatise to have survived to the present is the *Ten Chapters* of Thomas of Kafartāb.²⁶⁷ Written in Arabic in the late eleventh century by the Maronite bishop of a town in the region of Aleppo, it is suggestive of what a Monothelete faith from Syria may have looked like. The *Ten Chapters* show that Thomas's Monotheletism was deeply grounded in the words of scripture, much more so than in any patristic or conciliar precedent.²⁶⁸ Over and over again, he cites the words of Christ or events from the life of Christ and asks his Dyothelete opponent how these can be made sense of if Christ had two wills.

267 The *Kitāb al-hudā*, or *Book of Direction*, an eleventh-century Maronite work translated into Arabic from a now-lost Syriac original, was clearly Monothelete (see, e.g., Fahed, *Kitāb al-hudā*, 32: "We do not believe concerning [Christ] that he is two: not two Christs, not two persons, not two wills, not two energies" [my translation]). The *Kitāb al-hudā* contains a brief section of aporetic dilemmas aimed at showing the absurdities that follow from believing Christ had two wills, and also makes reference to various passages in the Gospels (e.g., Matthew 8:2–3, 11:27) (Fahed, *Kitāb al-hudā* [n. 182 above], 48–49), but the great majority of the *Kitāb al-hudā*, unlike Thomas's *Ten Chapters*, is unconcerned with the question of Christ's willing.

268 Though he would cite patristic and conciliar authorities, too. See, e.g., Thomas's citation of Ephrem the Syrian (Chartouni, *Traité* [n. 41 above], 13 [Arabic = 78 French trans.]), Basil (ibid., 17 [82 trans.]), Gregory (ibid., 17 [82 trans.]), Jacob of Sarug (ibid., 20 [85 trans.]), Cyril (ibid., 25 [90 trans.]), his reference to Nicaea and Chalcedon (ibid., 26 [92 trans.]), to Nicaea, Constantinople, Antioch, Ephesus, and other councils (ibid., 33 [98 trans.]), and his citation of the Council of Antioch (ibid., 38 [103 trans.]).

265 H. Chadwick, "Eucharist and Christology in the Nestorian Conflict," *JTS* n.s. 2 (1951): 145–64.

266 Gregg and Groh attempted to do the same with the Arian Controversy. See R. C. Gregg and D. E. Groh, "The Centrality of Soteriology in Early Arianism," *Anglican Theological Review* 59 (1977): 260–78 and eidem, *Early Arianism: A View of Salvation* (Philadelphia, 1981).

For Thomas, the starting point of the whole question was Jesus's statement: "I have come to do not my will, but the will of Him who sent me" (John 5:30). This amounted to nothing less than a denial by Christ that he had a human will.²⁶⁹ Christ had also said, "I can do nothing of myself; rather, I judge as I hear, and my judgment is just" (John 5:30), a statement that Thomas also took as indicating a lack of human will.²⁷⁰ When the leper told Christ, "Lord, if you are willing, you can make me clean," Thomas pointed out, Christ did not respond, "I am willing, in my divinity and in my humanity." He said simply, "I am willing" (Mark 1:40–41).²⁷¹ Christ had no need of a human will to carry out human actions, he could do all these things through his divine will—after all, David had affirmed that everything the Lord wills he does (Psalms 147:5).²⁷² Before the Incarnation, had Christ not made his walking audible to Adam in the Garden and then spoken to Adam (Genesis 3:8–9)? Had he not eaten with Abraham and asked him, "Where is Sarah, your wife?" (Genesis 18:8–9). Had he not shown his power to Moses, brought the children of Israel out of Egypt, and drowned the Egyptians (Exodus 14:27)?²⁷³

Thomas saw the transformation that was effected in a believer at baptism as an image of the humanity of the Incarnate Christ. "He came unto his own, but his own did not receive him," Thomas noted, citing John's Gospel, but those who did receive him

"became sons of God, who have been born not of the desire of the body and not from the will of man, but from God" (John 1:11–12). In other words, when they passed through the baptismal

font, the Spirit of God came to dwell in their intellects and sanctified them [sc. their intellects] and extirpated from them the will of the flesh. There did not remain a will in their flesh, nor desire; He called them His brothers when His divine Spirit indwelt them and He made them sons of His Father by honor.

The baptized believer, made a son of God through Christ's generosity, now no longer had a fleshly will, just like the Son of God himself. Just as Adam, before he sinned, did not have a will which knew evil, Thomas argued, but rather had a free intellect which looked to his Creator and subsisted by the will of his Lord, so it was in the case of Christ, whose humanity was not the result of sexual intercourse and who was free from that which is typically human and from the will of this world.²⁷⁴ The incarnate Christ, therefore, was like the prelapsarian Adam, and so too was the baptized Christian.²⁷⁵

For Thomas, affirming two wills meant affirming two Christs and believing in two Sons;²⁷⁶ Dyothelites brought division and separation into the union of Christ's natures: Arius was their grandfather and Nestorius their paternal uncle.²⁷⁷ Dyothelite belief also posed problems for the practice of praying to Christ.²⁷⁸ It also bears noting that the final two of Thomas's *Ten Chapters* deal not with the question of wills in Christ, but rather with a matter related to Christian worship—the question of the Trisagion. Monotheletes used the longer version of the thrice-holy hymn and Dyothelites did not. In other words, Dyothelites and Monotheletes, at least in Syria, were separated by different liturgical practices.²⁷⁹ Nowhere in Thomas's account is there any

269 Ibid., 13 (78 trans.). One Maronite rite of ordination has the bishop read the following to a priest at his ordination: "Be united in the true faith with Jesus Christ who has made you worthy to serve in this office. It is the faith of our saints and fathers and the Apostles as well as the faith affirmed by the Councils, and the canons which contain their true teaching that our Lord and God Jesus Christ is one person, one Son, one Christ, and one will. For this reason He said, 'I have come not to do my will but the will of Him who sent me.' God forbid that He has two wills, and that after their union the Trinity be called a Quaternity" (translation M. Moosa from Vatican Syriac 48 in idem, *The Maronites in History* [Syracuse, 1986], 207).

270 Chartouni, *Traité*, 22 (87 trans.).

271 Ibid., 16 (81 trans.).

272 Ibid., 35 (100 trans.).

273 Ibid., 40 (104 trans.).

274 Ibid., 22–23 (87–88 trans.).

275 On Adam's prelapsarian will and Christ's will, see, too, ibid., 25–26 (91 trans.). Through his mercy, Christ took up our humanity to put an end to our sinful will and to return it to the will of his Father (36 [101 trans.]). Price, "Monotheletism" (n. 94 above), 224, discusses other Monotheletes' views of Adam's prelapsarian will.

276 Chartouni, *Traité*, 16–17 (82 trans.).

277 Ibid., 33 (98 trans.).

278 Ibid., 38 (103 trans.).

279 Ibid., 42–48 (105–12 trans.). The close relationship between Maronite and Syrian Orthodox liturgical practices has long been noted; see, e.g., A. Raes, *Introductio in liturgiam orientalium* (Rome, 1947), 11 and J. Mearns, *The Canticles of the Christian Church, Eastern and Western, in Early and Medieval Times* (Cambridge,

sense that he is espousing an artificial doctrinal concoction or compromise.

When reading Thomas and when thinking about the spiritual vision presumed by a Monothelete Christology, Jad Hatem's observation that Monotheletism was particularly fitting for an ascetic piety is worth keeping in mind.²⁸⁰ Maximus was himself

1914), 40. After the Byzantine conquest of Antioch in 969, however, Dyothelite Chalcedonian liturgical practices came to conform to those of Constantinople. See J.-M. Sauget, "À propos des 'Premières recherches sur l'origine et les caractéristiques des synaxaires melchites (XI^e–XVII^e siècles)," in *Mémorial Mgr Gabriel Khouri-Sarkis (1898–1968), fondateur et directeur de L'Orient Syrien, 1956–1967*, ed. F. Graffi (Louvain, 1969), 37–46 and J. Nasrallah, "La liturgie des Patriarcats melchites de 969 à 1300," *OC* 71 (1987): 156–59. Moosa, *Maronites in History*, 207 offers two different examples of explicitly Monothelete affirmations in Maronite liturgical material. In addition to the one I cited above (n. 270), Moosa also notes the following propitiatory prayer from the beginning of the Maronite mass: "Praise be to the Merciful one who dwelt in Mary in lowliness and shone forth from her womb as a man in humility. He went out to the wilderness with an ineffable union of His two true natures. He is one person and one will maintaining the properties of the dual natures without division" (translation Moosa). A thorough study of Maronite and old Melkite liturgical manuscripts would perhaps turn up more examples of Monothelete liturgical affirmations (see above, n. 202).

280 J. Hatem, *Recherches sur les christologies Maronites* (Paris, 2002), 19: "La christologie monothélète présente au Chrétien le

a devotional master and the human will played an important role in his spiritual vision.²⁸¹ If we are to explain the deeply held faith of a figure like Macarius of Antioch, one which lasted for centuries and found expression in someone like Thomas of Kafartāb (and the equally adamant faith of someone like Maximus), something more than power politics, doctrinal compromise, and accidental moments of doctrinal invention needs to be brought into the picture. In addition to doctrinal differences that came to vary according to region, the challenge facing historians and theologians seeking to explain this controversy in a satisfying and nonreductive way is one of the *lex orandi*: to examine the forms of devotion and anthropologies that Monenergism-Monotheletism and Dyenergism-Dyothelitism presuppose and to offer an account that takes prayer and the spiritual life as seriously as it does politics and doctrine.

parfait modèle de l'idéal monastique: la totale soumission de la volonté humaine à la volonté divine jusqu'au point d'évanouissement. L'imitation de Jésus est croisée avec l'abandon à Dieu."

281 On the importance of the will in human redemption and in human divinization in Maximus's pre-Monothelete-controversy thought, see recently J. Gavin, "Becoming an Exemplar for God: Three Early Interpretations of Forgiveness in the Lord's Prayer," *Logos* 16 (2013): 137–41, esp. 137–39 and NB, 138 n. 47.

✦ THIS ARTICLE REPRESENTS A CONSIDERABLY expanded version of a paper I first wrote in 2006 for John Haldon. Over the years, the original essay circulated informally; John Haldon, Peter Brown, Sebastian Brock, David Taylor, Philip Booth, Julia Konstantinovskiy, Scott Johnson, and a number of others read the piece, encouraged me to publish it, and provided beneficial comments and suggestions. After I

revised and expanded the original essay, David Jenkins and Lucas van Rompay read it and provided me with valuable suggestions. I have also benefited greatly from the spirited and subtle criticisms and rich bibliographic suggestions by *DOP*'s anonymous readers. Even after (or perhaps because of) years of gestation, I am only too aware of the manifold shortcomings that remain in this piece; all blame for them should be directed solely at me.